

**The Self-Education of Cyrus:
A Literary Commentary on Book 1
of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia***

Graham Ian Hogg B.A.

Ph.D. Classics

The University of Edinburgh

1997

The Self-Education of Cyrus: A Literary Commentary
on Book 1 of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*
Abstract of thesis

The purpose of this thesis is to provide a literary commentary and analysis of the first book of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*. The work has traditionally been regarded as an enigma, its subject matter being too diverse and its structure and purpose unclear. Moreover, in contrast with Xenophon's other works and other fourth-century prose literature, the text has been regarded as being tedious and having little intrinsic worth. In recent years, however, there has been a resurgence of scholarly interest in the *Cyropaedia*. James Tatum's *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction*, Bodil Due's *The Cyropaedia* and Deborah Gera's *Xenophon's Cyropaedia* have broken new ground in analysing the work as a whole and bringing it into line with the rest of Xenophon's works. What is lacking in this re-evaluation of the *Cyropaedia* is a detailed literary commentary on the work. Previous commentaries have dealt primarily with grammar, syntax and textual criticism, or have examined the work as a valuable source for Persian history and ethnography.

The thesis focuses on Book 1, approaching it not in terms of one particular genre but as a complex work drawing from all the branches of Greek literature as well as from the author's own knowledge and experiences gained during the course of a very eventful life. The commentary accordingly interprets the *Cyropaedia* in the context of earlier Greek literature, to show that Xenophon uses and refers back to the works of his literary predecessors to construct a work which is innovative rather than derivative. The importance of Book 1 lies in the way Xenophon introduces the themes and ideas which will be explored in the course of the remaining seven books. Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus the child in the first book is not only remarkably vivid, it is also a very subtle examination of the successful leader in his youth, of how he seeks to educate himself through undergoing a wide range of experiences, and of the various tactics he uses to make his elders carry out his wishes.

The introduction to the thesis deals with the Greek audience for the work, Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus, the Near-Eastern world he creates in the *Cyropaedia* and, above all, the literary antecedents of the work. The author's use of Near-Eastern sources is discussed before moving on to look at four areas of previous Greek literature which had some influence on Xenophon's narrative and presentation of character: Homeric epics, wisdom literature, drama and Herodotus. The problems involved in dating the work are briefly considered, as well as an explanation of the methodology of the commentary.

The commentary itself is organised according to the six chapters which make up Book 1. Each chapter is given a synopsis outlining its content, structure and the themes introduced by the author, followed by an analysis of the text, highlighting significant words and phrases. The commentary is followed by four appendices dealing with subjects outside its immediate remit: on Xenophon's creation of Cyaxares, king of the Medes; the '*paidikos logos*' of Book 1; the didactic role of Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia*; and finally, the interpretation of the work in Machiavelli and in Renaissance literature.

Contents

Preface	<i>i</i>
---------	----------

Introduction

Methodology	<i>6</i>
(A) Audience	<i>6</i>
(B) Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus	<i>10</i>
(C) The world of the <i>Cyropaedia</i>	<i>14</i>
(D) Precursors	<i>22</i>
(E) Date of the work	<i>59</i>

Commentary on Book 1

Chapter 1	<i>61</i>
Chapter 2	<i>83</i>
Chapter 3	<i>108</i>
Chapter 4	<i>134</i>
Chapter 5	<i>170</i>
Chapter 6	<i>198</i>

Appendix A	<i>246</i>
Appendix B	<i>250</i>
Appendix C	<i>255</i>
Appendix D	<i>270</i>

<i>Bibliography</i>	<i>286</i>
---------------------	------------

Preface

It has become almost mandatory to preface any work of scholarship on Xenophon with a note lamenting the neglect of his works - in particular the *Cyropaedia* - by scholars since the Renaissance. This scholarly neglect of the *Cyropaedia* has been remedied in recent years, beginning with the publication of James Tatum's *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction* in 1989. Tatum begins by dealing with the reception of the work during the Renaissance. He then analyses the work in terms of the relationships that Cyrus forms with the other characters to show that Xenophon gives us a portrait of the Machiavellian leader, who cleverly manipulates others to achieve his ends. The *Cyropaedia* is thus a work of 'imperial fiction' which displays a great understanding of the problems and techniques of leadership and presents a practical, instead of utopian, view of the empire that Cyrus eventually creates. In the same year (1989) Bodil Due's *The Cyropaedia: Xenophon's Aims and Methods* appeared, which took a different approach to Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus. Due regards the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* as having been shaped by the techniques of historical writing. Her view of Xenophon's Cyrus is of an ideal leader who embodies moral strength and espouses praiseworthy values for all mankind to follow. The figure of the Persian king is accordingly presented as Xenophon's solution to the problems of ruling, namely his belief in the placing of power in the hands of a morally superior individual. In 1993 scholarship on the *Cyropaedia* was considerably augmented by Deborah Gera's *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique*. Gera examines the work in terms of its three formal narrative structures: Socratic-style dialogues, the *symposia*, and novellae, providing informed analysis of each area, and showing their literary antecedents.

This thesis acknowledges the respective strengths of all three scholars' work, as is attested by the number of citations in it of 'Tatum', 'Due' and 'Gera', whilst at the same time seeking to evaluate their respective contributions to study of the *Cyropaedia* and to examine areas of the work which they have not considered. Apart from those three publications, other recent works which have looked at the *Cyropaedia* - in

particular Steven Hirsch's *The Friendship of Barbarians* and Joan Todd's *Greek Paideia and Persian Historia* - have analysed it for its contribution to our understanding of Persian history and ethnography, in order to show that Xenophon demonstrates a considerable knowledge of Persian lifestyle and institutions in the *Cyropaedia* and in his other works. There has, however, been a lack of a detailed literary commentary on the work which places the *Cyropaedia* within the context of other Greek literature, including the other works attributed to Xenophon. Nineteenth century commentaries on the *Cyropaedia* have dealt primarily with grammar, syntax and textual criticism, of which the main example is the Rev. H. A. Holden's commentary on the work, which was published in 1887-1890. More recently, the Budé editions of the *Cyropaedia*, edited by Marcel Bizos and Édouard Delebecque and published in three volumes between 1971-1973, provides an informative but limited commentary on the text. Richard Stoneman has also produced an extremely concise but illuminating commentary on particular areas of the narrative for the 'layman' in the reissue of H. G. Dakyns' translation of the *Cyropaedia* in 1992.

By contrast, the purpose of this commentary is to provide in-depth literary analysis of the narrative of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia*, highlighting themes and showing where they recur at later points in the work and how they are developed. Reference is made to parallels found in other works of Xenophon and in the works of his literary predecessors. As the accent of the commentary is on re-evaluating and understanding the *Cyropaedia* as a work of literature, it should be emphasised that this is not a linguistic commentary, nor does it cover matters relating to textual criticism, so prominent in early commentaries on the work.

Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* is of great importance when considering the whole of the work. Xenophon uses it to reveal his agenda for the *Cyropaedia*, explaining what has inspired him to produce the work and introducing themes which will be explored at length in the later narrative. The established division of the text of the *Cyropaedia* into eight books, subdivided by chapters, has been maintained for the purposes of this commentary - not in order that Book 1 should be treated in isolation from the other seven books, but rather as an integral part of the whole work. Some episodes' relevance

to the overall work is not established until a later point in the narrative. For instance, Xenophon's reasons for including Cyrus' seemingly inconsequential dealings with the Medes Araspas and Artabazus in Book 1 do not become fully apparent until Books 4 and 5. Thus the *Cyropaedia* should be regarded as a series of personal encounters and episodes, which may seem complete in themselves, but which are carefully linked together by the unfolding narrative of Cyrus' *paideia*. The commentary therefore seeks throughout to make reference to relevant parallel passages from Books 2-8 of the *Cyropaedia*.

The commentary has been organised by providing a synopsis, followed by a commentary on the relevant words and phrases, for each of the six chapters to Book 1. The synopses provide a summary of the narrative, and are then devoted to examining the main themes introduced by Xenophon in that particular chapter. In view of the fact that Xenophon repeats and links certain ideas and themes throughout the narrative of Book 1, I have dealt with themes at the point where they are introduced instead of the point where they are more fully developed. In order to keep the synopses as concise as possible, other important points relating to each chapter have been dealt with either in the body of the commentary or in the four appendices. The introduction comprises four sections covering aspects of the *Cyropaedia* that are particularly relevant to the commentary on Book 1: (A) the intended audience of the *Cyropaedia*, (B) Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus, (C) his portrayal of the non-Greek world of the *Cyropaedia* and (D) literary precursors of the work. I have also included a brief section on the question of dating the *Cyropaedia* (E), as well as an opening section on the methods employed in the organisation of presentation of the commentary. These sections are intended to be concise rather than comprehensive and to provide a literary and historical background to the discussion of the *Cyropaedia* in the commentary. The appendices cover four topics relating directly and indirectly to the *Cyropaedia*, which I have deemed worthy of examination outside the confines of the commentary: Appendix A deals with Xenophon's creation of Cyrus' maternal uncle, Cyaxares king of the Medes; Appendix B covers the meeting between Cyrus and Median admirer Artabazus, the *paidikos logos* of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia*; Appendix C examines Cyrus' didactic role within the

Cyropaedia, with emphasis on his final speech to his sons in Book 8; and Appendix D deals with the reception of the work in the Renaissance, and in particular, Machiavelli's use of the work in writing *The Prince*.

Acknowledgements

In the course of my studies I would like to acknowledge the support and helpful criticism of my Supervisors, Mr. J. G. Howie and Dr. N. K. Rutter, and of other staff of the Classics Department of Edinburgh University. I would also like to thank my colleagues of the British Antiquarian Division of the National Library of Scotland for their encouragement and forbearance over the last three years, in particular Dr. John Scally, and Dr. Ulrike Morét for her unfailing kindness and patience. Dr. Costas Panayotakis of the University of Glasgow and Dr. Yun Lee Too of the University of Liverpool also deserve thanks for their helpful suggestions and ideas. Above all, I would like to thank my parents, without whose support none of this would have been possible.

In accordance with the regulations of the University of Edinburgh, I hereby declare that this work is entirely my own and has not been written in collaboration.

Graham Hogg

Introduction

Methodology

The manuscript tradition of the *Cyropaedia* has preserved numerous variant readings of the text, which are usually interchangeable and rarely contradictory, so that it is almost impossible to recover Xenophon's Greek.¹ For the purposes of the thesis I have followed the text of the Budé edition prepared by Marcel Bizos and Édouard Delebecque, the most recent and comprehensive re-examination of the text of the *Cyropaedia*. All abbreviations of ancient authors and works conform to the format laid out in Liddell & Scott and Lewis & Short. References in brackets without an abbreviation refer to the text of the *Cyropaedia*. I have also adopted the policy of transliterating key Greek terms, which are not readily translated into English and occur frequently, into Roman alphabetical form (e.g. *polis*, *paideia*, *pleonexia* etc.). All translations of Greek text are my own, unless otherwise stated.

A. Audience

According to his [the Shah's] calculations, 1971 marked the 2,500 anniversary of the founding of the Persian Empire, and he celebrated the occasion in a fashion which may never be equalled for ceremony, colour and sheer excess of every kind. In the flat plain at Pasargadae, in front of the tomb of Cyrus, the Shah and the Empress Farah stood at the microphone ... As the boom of the guns died away, the Shah read an invocation that began 'O Cyrus, Great King, King of Kings' and ended 'O Cyrus, rest in peace for we are awake'.²

The description of the Shah of Iran's celebrations of the 2,500 the anniversary of the Persian Empire provides a fitting illustration of how people in positions of power can invoke the memory of historical figures to suit their own needs. In venerating the

¹ See Bizos 1971, I, liv ff. & Tatum 1989, 32 f.

² John Simpson, *Behind Iranian Lines*, London 1988, 148 f.

achievements of Cyrus the Great, the Shah sought to reclaim the memory of the first 'Great King' of the Persians for the Iranian people and to glorify his own position by presenting himself as a successor to Cyrus. The fact that he chose to pay homage to Cyrus, is, in large measure, due to the preservation of the image of the Persian king as a great and noble ruler in Greek and Jewish literature, when early Iranian literature seemed to have forgotten him.³ Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* had a prominent role in antiquity in ensuring the lasting memory of Cyrus in Western literature, and enjoyed a resurgence of popularity in the Renaissance,⁴ before sliding into obscurity in the last three centuries. It is unlikely that the Shah had any knowledge of the *Cyropaedia*. If he had encountered the work he might have paused when invoking the memory of Cyrus, to consider that even though the *Cyropaedia* provides a detailed and on the whole positive illustration of the absolute imperial power of Cyrus - the kind of power he aspired to - it also illustrates that such absolute power is not permanent and without good fortune and constant vigilance it can quickly decline, as the Shah would find out to his own cost before the end of the 1970s.

In moving back to the world of fourth century BC Greece and its reception of the *Cyropaedia*, one of the first logical steps to take when analysing the work is to ascertain the kind of audience for whom Xenophon intended it to be read and discussed. Such an issue is inevitably linked to the problem of dating the work and setting it within the chronology of the period - a process which is reliant more on speculation than factual evidence.⁵ It can be said with some certainty that literacy, in varying degrees, was widespread in Athens and other *poleis* of Greece at the time when Xenophon produced

³ Cook 1983, 42 notes that, "it is ironical that the name of Cyrus had no place in Iranian legendary history in Parthian and Sassanid times, and only among Greeks and Jews did his name survive".

⁴ See Appendix D for a discussion of the *Cyropaedia* in Renaissance literature.

⁵ The question of dating the *Cyropaedia* and of the chronology of Xenophon's other works remains fraught with difficulties and controversy. I have chosen to deal with the date of the *Cyropaedia* in a separate section (see Introduction E) and for the purpose of this section I have assumed that the work became available to the public in some form or other between 400-350 BC

the *Cyropaedia*.⁶ In the *Memorabilia* Xenophon depicts Euthydemus as having collected many written works, *grammata*, by the poets and the most famous sophists and was therefore regarded as being one of the wisest of the Athenian youth (*Mem.* 4.2.8). The existence of such written works should not be taken as evidence for a reading public, but of a public accustomed to listening to authors or trained readers reading from manuscripts.⁷ In view of the fact that the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* is largely based on dialogues between the characters, it would have been possible to perform excerpts from the work in much the same way as Socratic dialogues of Plato and Xenophon could have been performed to an audience.⁸

The identity of the audience to whom Xenophon's words were addressed can only be guessed at. The *Cyropaedia* is not addressed explicitly or implicitly to a particular person or ruling family, in the way that Isocrates addresses Demonicus, son of the Sicilian tyrant Evagoras, in the 'Cyprian Orations'. After being exiled from Athens Xenophon benefited in material terms from his association with the Spartan king Agesilaus, by being granted an estate at Scillus near Olympia,⁹ yet there is no reason to suppose he enjoyed literary patronage of the Spartans in the way that Plato did with Dion of Syracuse. The fictional Persians of the *Cyropaedia* resemble in some ways the historical Spartans, though there is no evidence to suppose that the work was composed

⁶ Dihle 1994, 215 asserts that "broad sections of the fourth-century public, and by no means only in Athens" were "steeped in the written word".

⁷ Kevin Robb arrives at this conclusion in a recent survey of literacy and its effect on *paideia* in Greece up to and including the first half of the fourth century (Robb 1994, 252 ff.). He observes that Greek, especially Athenian, culture in the fourth century still relied on the oral communication of literature of reading written texts, thus Greek literature down to this period had to provide and to anticipate the needs of the author's audience. It is therefore more appropriate to speak of Xenophon's readership as his 'audience'.

⁸ See Robb 1994, 235 f. On Plato's dialogues being 'paideutic textbooks' which were re-enacted by his pupils. The influence of Socratic dialogues on the *Cyropaedia* is considerable and is thoroughly and expertly analysed by Gera in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (Gera 1993, 26-131).

⁹ See *An.* 5.3.7 ff., *D. L.* 2.52 & *Paus.* 6.5.

exclusively for the benefit of a Spartan audience.

Nevertheless it is probable that the higher ranks of Spartan society, with whom Xenophon would have had contact, did read it.¹⁰ It is likely that the *Cyropaedia* was not aimed specifically at the citizens of any one particular Greek *polis*.¹¹ It was intended for as broad an audience as possible within the educated élite of Greek society, and was designed to appeal to people who constituted the ruling class of their respective states and had good knowledge of existing Greek literature. The broad appeal of the work becomes apparent if we regard the *Cyropaedia* as having a dual purpose:¹² on the one hand, it is a treatise of timeless wisdom on practical and ethical matters for the instruction and edification of young people and also for the reinforcement of the values and beliefs of the adult members of society;¹³ on the other, it is a major and unique contribution to the *politeia* literature of the fourth century,¹⁴ in which he advocates

¹⁰ Literacy in fourth century Sparta was probably not widespread, but the élite members of Spartan society were undoubtedly literate (Cartledge 1978, 25-37). Pomeroy 1994, 9 f. adopts this view when speculating that the *Oeconomicus* was probably read by Xenophon's acquaintances in Sparta.

¹¹ Delebecque throughout his *Essai sur la Vie de Xénophon*, assumes that Xenophon is writing primarily for an Athenian audience (see Appendix D, n. 24); however, apart from the *Poroi*, which is specifically about Athens, there is no indication in any of Xenophon's works that his native *polis* was foremost in his thoughts when composing his works. The *Cyropaedia* could have been written as an apology for Xenophon's pro-Spartan conduct in joining Cyrus the Younger's army and then in fighting under Agesilaus' command (as is suggested in Appendix D and by Carlier 1978, 137 n.), but such speculation remains unsubstantiated.

¹² This dual purpose of the work is further discussed in Appendix D in comparison with Machiavelli's *The Prince*.

¹³ See Introduction D (iii) on the influence of wisdom literature on the work.

¹⁴ See Synopsis to chapter 1 of the Commentary. See also Gera 1993, 11-13 for a survey of *politeia* literature; she believes that "Xenophon ... devotes but a small part of the *Cyropaedia* to an outline of good government, and much of the work has little to do with political reflections of any kind. So too the precise lessons to be learnt from the life and deeds of Cyrus are not always spelt out to the reader." Such an interpretation does not take into account the close equation of military leadership with political leadership that forms the basis of Xenophon's contribution to political theory of the

strong, autocratic leadership for *poleis* and is uncannily prophetic concerning the prominence of the Macedonian monarchy in Greece in the second half of the fourth century.¹⁵

B. *Xenophon's Portrayal of Cyrus*

The question of how the modern reader interprets Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus is crucial to reaching an understanding of the work as a whole. It has already been stated in the Preface how recent scholarship on the *Cyropaedia* has been divided in its assessment of the ideal of leadership supposedly represented by Xenophon's Cyrus: Tatum regards him as the ultimate Machiavellian figure of Greek literature who is always in control of events and everyone around him;¹⁶ in contrast, Due treats him as an ideal ruler whose main function is to act as an example, *paradeigma*, of virtue to

fourth century (see Synopsis to chapter 1). His description of how Cyrus reorganises his army and secures absolute control over it, then uses it to achieve dominion over the Near East, provides insights into leadership techniques which could be applied to the government of a *polis*. These techniques are intended to be ingenious, as they involve the deception and manipulation of both friend and foe as a means to achieving one's goal, therefore Xenophon adopts a subtle, understated approach to revealing them. Furthermore, his ideas may have been sufficiently controversial for him to avoid making explicit references to them, in order not to alienate those of audience, who shared his moral beliefs, but not his political ones.

¹⁵ See Farber 1979, 497 ff. It is generally accepted that Xenophon died c. 355 just as the exploits of Philip II of Macedon were beginning to impinge on the trading interests and colonies of the Greek *poleis* in the North-east of the Greek mainland. Thus Xenophon did not live long enough, unlike Isocrates, to witness the rise of Macedonian power and the *Cyropaedia* should be viewed as a commentary on the effectiveness of monarchy in general, not specifically of Macedonian kingship.

¹⁶ E.g. Tatum 1989, 71, "Here we may perceive the particular genius of *The Education of Cyrus*. Running in strict counterpoint to this bland success story is that activity I have already alluded to: Cyrus' constant manipulation of everyone he meets ... he is never simply what he seems ... His serene rise to power subverts the world into which he was born."

Xenophon's audience and to be the embodiment of excellent moral qualities.¹⁷ Due's picture of a wholly benevolent figure who transcends his surroundings and appeals to all ranks of society is supported by Philip Stadter, who rejects Tatum's view of Cyrus as a manipulative figure, believing that Xenophon has created a "utopian vision of ideal behaviour" in his portrayal of Cyrus.¹⁸ Conveniently, Gera provides a third opinion which is a synthesis of the two previous ones. She recognises that Cyrus in many respects is supposed to be an ideal ruler, who serves as a *paradeigma* in the same way that Xenophon portrays other ideal figures, such as Agesilaus, Socrates and himself in the *Anabasis*.¹⁹ However, she does admit that Xenophon does occasionally strike a jarring note in his portrayal of the sanitised hero. She also believes that from chapter 5 of Book 7 onwards, when Cyrus is installed in Babylon, we receive a far more complex view of him, which is at odds with the model figure of the previous narrative.²⁰ The empire created by Cyrus is far from being utopian and is positively despotic and repressive, whilst Cyrus himself displays a "selfish and utilitarian outlook" that leaves a feeling of unease in the reader and highlights the inconsistency in Xenophon's depiction of Cyrus.²¹ Gera is left to conclude that "there is a certain distance or tension in this final section of the work between Xenophon and his hero: in order to become an efficient ruler of an empire, Cyrus has had to change, and changing means parting from some of his old exemplary ways". According to Gera, the changes initiated by Cyrus

¹⁷ E.g. Due 1989, 147, "Cyrus is the *paradeigma*, the model on which the perfect leader *in spe* can pattern himself."

¹⁸ Stadter 1991, 490 f. Due goes as far as to assert that in the *Cyropaedia* and in his other works, Xenophon is advocating the creation of a utopia consisting of a "huge multinational empire" where the nations are integrated to a high degree and the rulers are selected entirely on merit (Due 1989, 240).

¹⁹ Gera 1993, 280 ff. She believes that "Xenophon seems to identify with Cyrus, and portray him quite simply as a model figure to be emulated: there are very few hints of any distance between the author and his hero" (*ibid.*, 285).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 285 ff.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 288 & 294.

after his conquest of Babylon are meant to be seen as precursors of the moral downfall of the Persians.

It would be wrong to dismiss any of these three opinions on Xenophon's portrayal of the Cyrus as being entirely incorrect, although the utopian, idealised view of the *Cyropaedia* advocated by Due and Stadter appears increasingly improbable when one considers, as Gera rightly does, the despotic nature of Cyrus' administration in Babylon. The best approach for accounting for the apparent inconsistency in the depiction of Cyrus before and after his conquest of Babylon is to accept that Xenophon intended his protagonist to be both a paradeigmatic figure who exemplified ideal moral values and at the same time a Machiavellian leader who was unafraid to manipulate and deceive people to achieve his own ends. The ambiguous image of Cyrus accords with the dual purpose of the work mentioned above: Cyrus, like the *Cyropaedia* itself, appeals to his audience on two different levels, as a paragon of virtue and as a shrewd and ruthless leader of men. Xenophon clearly works on the assumption that these two traits of Cyrus' character need not be mutually exclusive in view of the exceptional nature of Cyrus the individual, though, to the modern reader, he occasionally struggles to maintain a balance in his presentation of the Persian ruler (hence Gera's claim that Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus contains occasional jarring notes). Moreover, both these traits are present in Cyrus from his childhood onwards (as will be demonstrated in the Commentary to Book 1), so the picture of Cyrus after the conquest of Babylon is not at odds with the image of Cyrus in the preceding narrative, as Gera supposes, nor is Xenophon seeking to distance himself from the protagonist of his work in Books 7-8.

The idea of Cyrus' character representing the individual's pursuit of power at all costs whilst maintaining high ethical standards brings Xenophon's portrait of him into close relationship with the Cynic ideal of man.²² The Cyrus of the *Cyropaedia* can be seen as belonging to a tradition that venerated moral pre-eminence and individualism, and he resembles in many respects the Cynic conception of two mythical heroes,

²² See Høistad 1948, 73 ff. for an invaluable discussion of the individual-ethical portrayal of Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia* and the close relationship of Xenophon with the Cynic tradition.

Heracles and Odysseus. Both Heracles and Odysseus were renowned for their illustrious deeds at an early age,²³ and Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* is notable for the care and detail with which the boy Cyrus' precocious behaviour is described. Xenophon understands the importance of demonstrating that Cyrus is marked out from childhood onwards as an exceptional individual. He consequently gives his audience a series of episodes designed to enhance the impression that Cyrus is superior to everyone around him and has an intuitive grasp of the techniques of leadership, which enables him to educate himself rather than be reliant on others for instruction; hence the best title for the *Κύρου Παιδεία*, 'Education of Cyrus', the name traditionally assigned to the work since antiquity, would be the 'Self-Education of Cyrus'. This impression is heightened by the contrast between the author's care in creating a balanced picture of the young Cyrus, with his faults and good qualities, and the majestic but somehow featureless adult of Books 2-8,²⁴ whose actions take on an air of inevitability and invincibility which dispel any tension in the narrative. Any human frailties in Cyrus which threaten to obscure the points Xenophon wishes to make about the qualities which make for good leadership and government are removed, apart from isolated and understandable instances of bravery verging on foolhardiness amidst the collective frenzy of the battlefield (1.4.22 & 3.3.62). He is also prepared to admit to Croesus that he has a craving for wealth (8.2.20), but this is a weakness he says that he shares with the rest of mankind. On the whole the adult Cyrus is immune to the temptations in his path and rarely displays any human failings.²⁵

At this point the influence of Cyrus the Younger on Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus should be mentioned. The links between Xenophon's descriptions of the two men

²³ E.g. Heracles strangling the serpents sent to kill him whilst still in his cradle (which is described in Pindar's first Nemean ode (*N.* 1.33 ff.), and Odysseus' hunting exploits at his grandfather Autolycus' court (*Od.* 19.392 ff. - see Introduction D (ii)).

²⁴ As Due 1989, 147 f. recognises.

²⁵ Only the grieving widow Panthea has the audacity to suggest that Cyrus may be to blame for anything, in this instance for spurring her husband on to sacrificing his life in battle (7.3.9 - see Tatum 1989, 184 f.); but even on this occasion, Panthea takes most of the blame herself and only says that perhaps Cyrus is culpable too.

have been well established.²⁶ However, as the preceding discussion shows, the Cyrus of the *Cyropaedia* is not simply a character based on the Cyrus of the *Anabasis*, nor is Xenophon indulging in wish fulfilment of what his former hopes were for the career of the young prince before the latter's death at the battle of Cunaxa. Xenophon certainly makes the point in the *Oeconomicus* that if Cyrus had not died so young he would have proved to be a great ruler (*Oec.* 4.18). In the *Cyropaedia* he chooses instead to highlight some of the qualities he mentions in his *encomium* of the younger Cyrus in the *Anabasis* (*An.* 1.9.1 ff.) and apply them to his complex depiction of the elder Cyrus.

C. *The World of the Cyropaedia*

The *Cyropaedia* has been regarded as presenting a vivid and accurate picture of Near Eastern society by scholars advocating Xenophon's use of Near Eastern sources for the work, but has also been seen as having the faintest Oriental colour when compared with the essentially Greek nature of most of the work.²⁷ It should be borne in mind that when producing a work exclusively based in the barbarian Near East (the term 'barbarian' being used strictly in the sense of 'not being Greek') Xenophon was free to create his own world, where he could transpose features of Greek society to suit the purposes of his narrative, as well as incorporating his own personal knowledge of the region into the text.²⁸ He would also have been sensitive to his audience's opinions

²⁶ E.g. Hirsch 1985, 72 ff., Due 1989, 187 ff. & Gera 1993 10 f. all see the clear connection between Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus the Great and the content of his encomium for his namesake who died at the battle of Cunaxa (*An.* 1.9.1 ff. - see Synopsis to chapter 1 for parallels in the education of the two men and Synopsis to chapter 4 for the *philanthrōpia* of both men.

²⁷ The former view is held by Hirsch 1985, 61 ff., whereas Tuplin 1990, 17-29 demonstrates that Xenophon's use of Persian décor in the *Cyropaedia* is highly selective to suit the purposes of his narrative and is sometimes inaccurate.

²⁸ See Georges 1994, 47 ff., "for the most part the Persians remained a *tabula rasa* upon which the Greeks drew a portrait in their own idiom, a portrait which

on how Persians and other non-Greeks should be portrayed. Such opinions would have been partly formed by the depiction of non-Greek peoples in previous literature. At this point Herodotus' considerable contribution to Greek knowledge of barbarian life and mores should be acknowledged, as well as the lost works of the ethnographers who satisfied Greek curiosity for knowledge of different societies in exotic lands. Drama also made a significant contribution in influencing accepted Greek attitudes towards Persians and barbarians in general.²⁹

It is difficult to provide a clear-cut and simple summary of fifth and fourth century Greek attitudes to Persians, and barbarians in general. From the literary evidence available it appears that by the time Xenophon was writing his works the Greeks were convinced of their moral and their martial superiority to non-Greek peoples, the latter feeling no doubt enhanced by the exploits of the Ten Thousand, led by Xenophon. Such feelings can be seen most clearly in the chauvinism of Athenian orators and the pan-Hellenism of Isocrates,³⁰ and can be traced back to the fifth century. Edith Hall notes that in Euripides' plays the idea of Greek superiority over barbarians "was so fundamental a dogma as to produce striking rhetorical effects on being inverted".³¹

Xenophon himself never explicitly advocates the moral superiority of the Greeks in any of his works, nor makes denigratory contrasts between Greeks and barbarians. In the *Anabasis* he is prepared to chronicle incidents of barbarian treachery and weakness, most notably in military matters, but he also depicts the failings of the Greeks during and after the expedition of the Ten Thousand and is often unsparing in his criticism (especially when he perceives himself to be the victim of their machinations).

answered to their own imaginative purposes".

²⁹ The potential influence of drama in general on the *Cyropaedia* is discussed in the next section (D (ii)). Aeschylus' *Persae* is examined in this section because of its importance as an early Greek portrayal of Persian society.

³⁰ See Dover 1974, 83 ff.

³¹ Hall 1989, 222.

The author's comparatively neutral approach towards the portrayal of barbarians, as Hirsch notes, not only undermines conventional notions of Xenophon being hostile to barbarians, and particularly Persians, it also raises questions about the homogeneity of fourth century Greek attitudes to barbarians.³² Although Xenophon himself may not have displayed any prejudice against barbarians, he is aware of the standard opinions of barbarians and in the *Agésilas* he depicts an incident that would have served to confirm not challenge these opinions. Agesilaus makes his troops despise their barbarian foes in his campaign in Asia Minor by stripping some prisoners naked to show their white and flabby bodies, so that his men thought fighting the enemy would be like fighting women (*Agés.* 1.28). Hirsch emphasises the motives behind Agesilaus' humiliation of his prisoners, which were to inspire his troops rather than to show disrespect for the Persians.³³ Yet the fact that Xenophon deemed the episode worthy of reporting and that he reiterates the same idea in the *Cyropaedia*, when he stresses the effeminacy and extraordinary lengths the Persians go to in order to shelter from the sun (8.8.15-17), suggests that the propaganda value of the incident went beyond the immediate purpose of inspiring the troops of the expedition and was admired by Greeks in general.

One of the earliest surviving literary portrayals of barbarians is in Aeschylus' *Persae*. Hall goes as far as to state that the *Persae*, performed first in 472 B.C., provides the earliest evidence of the "absolute polarization in Greek thought of the Hellene and barbarian" which occurred in the aftermath of the Persian Wars.³⁴ Aeschylus certainly reflects existing attitudes of the Greek world towards Persia, attitudes formed by their fear of the Persian threat to the autonomy of Greek *poleis*; however, Aeschylus' Persians are not portrayed in an unduly negative or unsympathetic light. Indeed, the *Persae* is important not only as a highly influential depiction of barbarians for a Greek audience, it also contributed to the Greek perception of Cyrus as a wise and paternal ruler and contributed to his transformation, from being regarded

³² *Ibid.*, x.

³³ Hirsch 1985, 41.

³⁴ Hall 1989, 57 ff.

simply as a historical ruler, into a legendary figure. In the play the ghost of Darius emphasises the magnitude of the disaster at Salamis by claiming that a reverse on this scale had never happened since one ruler had controlled Asia, which leads him to provide a genealogy of the Persian rulers, including Cyrus, who, unlike the others, receives more than a cursory mention and is given a flattering eulogy.

τρίτος δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Κῦρος, εὐδαίμων ἀνὴρ,
ἄρξας ἔθηκε πᾶσιν εἰρήνην φίλοις·
Λυδῶν δὲ λαὸν καὶ Φρυγῶν ἐκτήσατο,
Ἰωνίαν τε πᾶσαν ἤλασεν βίᾳ.

θεός γὰρ οὐκ ἤχθηρεν ὡς εὐφρων ἔφυ. *Pers.* 768-772

Third after him came Cyrus, a fortunate man,
Having come to power he gave peace to all his own people;
And mastered the people of Lydia and Phrygia.
He also subdued the whole of Ionia by force,
For the gods did not hate him because he was by nature a gracious man.

Thus the image of Cyrus as the successful and benevolent ruler of Persia is created. The Aeschylean ideal of Cyrus became the accepted view of the Persian king not just for fifth-century Athens but also for successive generations in the ancient world. It is this view which ultimately dictates Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus as the consummately successful leader.

In composing a play about foreign characters in foreign settings, Aeschylus, according to Hall, differentiated the Persians from the Greeks in five different ways: language, behaviour, ethnography, religion and politics, associating traits with them which became standard characteristics of Greek portrayals of barbarians.³⁵ Foreign names and vocabulary, elaborate style of expression, repetition and anaphora are used to distinguish the Persians linguistically. In terms of behaviour the Persians at their worst can be cruel, hierarchical, unduly fond of luxury and unrestrained in their emotions. Emphasis is placed on the differences of dress and warfare of the Persians, who ritually worship their dead kings. Political differences are stressed in the immensity of the Persian empire and the administration required to govern it, the strict rules of court etiquette and the despotic rule of the king, all of which serve to contrast the opposing Athenian political ideals. Hall concludes that the *Persae* "is not ornamented

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 76-98.

by oriental colouring but suffused by it” and that Aeschylus implied that the “Persians’ greatness held within it the seeds of its own destruction, as their ethnic temperament was liable to despotism, slavishness, excess, and their consequences”.³⁶

The Persians of the *Cyropaedia* do not conform to the worst barbarian characteristics exemplified by the protagonists of the *Persae*. They are paragons of self-restraint, discipline and benevolence who live in a strictly-regulated society with a rigorous educational system. Their monarchy is based on a comparatively sophisticated constitutional model of a king accountable to his *polis* and a Council of Elders, and Cyrus’ army is also shown adopting military tactics modelled on Greek hoplite warfare. In Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus’ first formal speech (1.5.7 ff.) is a standard piece of Greek rhetoric and the didactic conversation between him and his father in chapter 6 (1.6.2 ff.) is also very Greek in character. The lack of barbarian excesses in the behaviour of Xenophon’s Persians has led to the idea that they are to be regarded as being not just similar to Greeks in general, but also more specifically to the Spartans.³⁷

The ‘hellenisation’ of Xenophon’s Persians has one main purpose. Xenophon could not portray Cyrus the unique leader, a man who is deemed to be ‘worthy of admiration’ (1.1.6), nor the Persians in his army who lived by and wholeheartedly embraced his practical and ethical principles, in terms of the negative stereotype of the oriental barbarian that appears in the *Persae* and other Greek literature. It is with Cyrus and the Persians that the reader is expected to identify, to share their hopes and aspirations and to recognise their moral superiority over the other barbarian peoples they encounter. Thus, the apparent similarity between the world of the Persians of the *Cyropaedia* and that of the Greeks stems from Persian society being portrayed in keeping with ideas of a Greek author in a work designed for a Greek audience, where authentic ethnic details were not always foremost in the author’s mind.

There does remain one crucial difference between Xenophon’s Persians and Greek society. Xenophon bases Persian superiority over other peoples in the

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 99-100.

³⁷ Cf. Miller 1914, I, viii f. - see Synopsis to chapter 2 of the Commentary.

Cyropaedia on a different foundation, and one less permanent than the Greeks'. He puts the advancement of Persian civilisation squarely down to one man, in contrast to Greek society where the shared values and progress of their various *poleis* had ultimately elevated the Greeks in their own eyes above the older barbarian civilisations. He depicts Cyrus raising the profile of the Persians from being, as Cyrus claims, an insignificant people of Asia (8.7.7), into a great power, forging a new identity which is a combination of old values with new ideas borrowed from their neighbours. Cyrus defines the autocratic nature of their empire, in its organisation and administration, and the laws which will govern their way of life, all of which is all set down in detail in Books 7 and 8 of the work, and none of which could be said to be Greek in character. By reporting the unique features of Cyrus' empire, which Xenophon stresses are enduring features, some of which he had seen for himself, Xenophon seeks to distance his Persians from close comparisons with Greek civilization. The decline of the Persian civilisation described by Xenophon in his 'epilogue' (8.8.1 ff.) clearly underlines its dependence on the genius of one man, and after his death it degenerates to the level of the peoples whom Cyrus had conquered.

While the Persians of Cyrus' day may not resemble stereotypical barbarians, Xenophon's depiction of the Medes in the *Cyropaedia* is very much in keeping with popular expectation and conventional ideas of oriental peoples. Their status in Greek eyes as Persians of lesser status, almost indistinguishable from their overlords, gives Xenophon a free hand to portray them as different from the Persians in most respects. The Medes display a whole range of human weaknesses and temptations, and serve to emphasise Cyrus' own self-control, charisma and his masterly handling of situations involving them.

The *Cyropaedia* begins with the roles of the two peoples reversed, the Persians being the poor relations of the Medes, then Cyrus gains the ascendancy over the Medes, through his cunning undermining of the Medes' importance militarily, and the courting of Median support at the cost of the sovereignty of their king, Cyaxares. The differences in behaviour between Mede and Persian are stressed in Book 1, when the young Cyrus' first visit to Media is placed immediately after the description of the rigorous Persian

educational system (1.3.1 ff.). Xenophon cleverly chooses the twelve-year-old boy to act as a commentator on the Median lifestyle. Cyrus' initial reactions to his surroundings are a combination of juvenile naiveté and honesty bordering on bluntness. His expressions of wonder at the luxury and excess that he witnesses, highlight the typically barbarian features of the Median court from a Greek perspective.³⁸ The Medes are shown to dress and act in ways which correspond to the most alien features of the stereotypical barbarian displayed in Greek literature from the time of Aeschylus' *Persae*. The cruelty, despotism, love of luxury and lack of restraint are all present in Xenophon's Media and are embodied in the two kings Astyages, and his successor Cyaxares. Xenophon also inserts a brief episode to show the sensuality of the Median court, exemplified by the amorous conduct of the then anonymous Median nobleman, Artabazus, who openly flirts with Cyrus, taking opportunities to kiss the youth twice as he prepares to return to Persia (1.4.27 ff.).³⁹ In addition to Artabazus' lack of restraint, the Mede Araspas predictably succumbs to the beauty of the captive Panthea, eventually threatening the woman whom he was appointed to protect with rape (6.1.33).

The gulf in lifestyle and *mores* between Mede and Persian is emphasised by Astyages' ignorance of the Persian lifestyle and customs, when he asks Cyrus whether Cambyses ever drinks to excess (1.3.11), and also by the behaviour of his son Cyaxares after the first victory of the Medes and Persians over the Assyrians.⁴⁰ The contrast between Mede and Persian, on this second occasion between the acceptable Persian behaviour and the debauched Median conduct, is vividly demonstrated by Xenophon. On the one hand the Persians and Cyrus' Median followers rest after their successful pursuit of the routed enemy, but remain vigilant in order to guard their prisoners. On the other, Cyaxares and his few remaining tent companions drink and listen to music, Xenophon drily remarking that those that stayed awake had a chance to enjoy all possible pleasures (4.5.7). To complete the unedifying spectacle Cyaxares' drunkenness

³⁸ See Synopsis to chapter 3 of Commentary.

³⁹ See Appendix B for a detailed discussion of this scene.

⁴⁰ See Appendix A on the despotic and weak character of Cyaxares.

is matched by that of the Median servants who are left to drink their fill, thus aping the behaviour of their masters - a clear sign of the breakdown of order in the Median camp (4.5.8).

Xenophon gradually introduces into the narrative an impressive array of oriental peoples who fall under Persian influence. The mention of exotic peoples such as Chaldaeans, Cadusians, Sacians, Hyrcanians, and Indians, has the cumulative effect of firmly anchoring the work in the distant East. In war all the different peoples, from the inept Armenians to the warlike Chaldaeans, prove to be no match for Persians, with the notable exception of the Egyptians (7.1.30 ff.). The Assyrians and allies follow typical barbarian practice in taking their women and possessions into battle, which still fails to provide sufficient incentive for them to stand up to the onslaught of the Persians (3.3.67). The Assyrian women are left deserted and their behaviour mirrors that of the Armenian royal family, when they believe that their king has condemned himself to death for his insurrection against the Medes (3.1.13 ff.). Xenophon imparts some Oriental colour to the narrative on both occasions by describing the emotional style of mourning employed by both peoples. The son of the Armenian king begins lamenting what he thinks will be the inevitable execution of his father, casting aside his tiara and ripping his garments, which spurs the women present to cry out and disfigure themselves, “ἐδρύπτοντο” (*ibid.*); furthermore, the Armenian prince is wearing *peploi*, the word used for the long robes of Eastern male attire.⁴¹ The Armenian women scar their cheeks just as the Assyrian women do following the defeat of their men in the first battle with Cyrus, “[αἱ γυναῖκες] καταρρηγνύμεναι τε πέπλους καὶ δρυπτόμεναι” (3.3.67).⁴²

Xenophon seeks to differentiate between these various peoples and the Persians in the same way as he compares the Medes unfavourably with the Persians. The

⁴¹ Cf. Panthea’s reaction on hearing that she is now the property of Cyrus (5.1.6); cf. also Aeschylus’ description in the *Persae* of Xerxes’ reaction to the Persian defeat at Salamis, “ῥήξας δὲ πέπλους κάνακωκύσας λιγύ” (*Pers.* 468).

⁴² Cf. Homer’s account of the mourning of Andromache in the *Iliad*, when Priam, Hecuba and Andromache see the corpse of Hector being dragged around outside the walls of Troy. The fall of Andromache’s tiara from her head as she faints is a portent of the days when she will no longer be a princess (*Il.* 22.466 ff.).

behaviour of Cyrus' enemy the Assyrian prince provides a perfect example of typical barbarian cruelty. The Assyrian subjects Gobryas, grieving for the loss of his only son (4.6.2), and the emasculated nobleman Gادات provide eloquent testimony to the prince's brutality (5.4.29 ff.). Even Cyrus' allies can be at fault, being guilty of greed and impetuosity. The indiscipline of the Cadusian prince results in their force becoming detached from the main army and then being easy prey for the Assyrians (5.4.15), and the Chaldaeans disobey orders and plunder Sardis (7.2.5). The overall effect Xenophon achieves in the *Cyropaedia* is to portray a barbarian world in which the Persians firmly belong and yet are distinguished from their neighbours through their behaviour and strict moral code. Xenophon freely employs some of the standard characteristics of Greek portrayal of barbarians when portraying the non-Persians in the *Cyropaedia*, whilst at the same time endeavouring to present the Persians as exceptional, noble barbarians whose superiority, exemplified by their leader, justified their success.

D. Precursors

In the introduction to her recent work on Xenophon's *Hellenica* Vivienne Gray notes that,

In view of the lack of a preface there has been a natural tendency to try and understand the *Hellenica* in the light of its antecedents. This is in line with the tendency of most ancient literature to imitate what is best in a tradition and innovate in that context. Xenophon shows that tendency over a wide range of his other works.⁴³

In a footnote she goes on to mention the *Memorabilia*, the *Hiero*, and the *Cynegeticus* as examples of "innovation within the context of traditional form". The *Cyropaedia* is worthy of inclusion in this list of works, since it displays Xenophon's knowledge of existing literary traditions and his ability to ally them with his own style and ideas, thus creating an innovative piece of literature.

The *Cyropaedia*, unlike the *Hellenica*, does have a preface - a meditation on the

⁴³ Gray 1989, 1.

difficulties involved in ruling mankind (1.1.1 ff.) - but there is still a need to understand the work in the light of its antecedents. Xenophon's account of the education of Cyrus is a long sprawling work of prose which freely mixes fact and fiction, the technical and the philosophical, and which, in its organisation of varied subject matter around the life story of a semi-mythical Persian king, bears little relation to any of the prose works of contemporary or previous Greek authors. It has consequently gained the reputation among some modern scholars of being something of an enigma.⁴⁴ This reputation is unwarranted, particularly when one examines the roots of the *Cyropaedia* in earlier Greek literature and the stimuli arguably provided by contemporary authors. The *Cyropaedia* is an eclectic rather than an enigmatic work and the diverse content of the *Cyropaedia* reflects the variety of its antecedents. This chapter is therefore devoted to examining some of these antecedents in order to ascertain which literary traditions primarily influenced the work, and to see how Xenophon used them or departed from them, following the ancient tendency to imitate and innovate.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Hirsch 1985, 66: "When all is said and done, the *Cyropaedia* is an enigma and will probably remain so".

⁴⁵ Both Due (Due 1989, 117 ff.) and Gera (Gera 1993, 1 ff.) include detailed sections in their works devoted to Xenophon's probable Greek and Near Eastern sources for the *Cyropaedia*. In the Precursors section I have chosen to deal with Greek literary antecedents up to and including the fifth century. The influence of fourth century literature (e.g. the works of Antisthenes, Plato and Isocrates) on the *Cyropaedia* is a potentially vast topic that is beyond the scope of this thesis and rests to a large extent on the assignment of speculative dates for the relevant literature. It has to some extent been covered by Due (*ibid.*) and Gera (*ibid.*); Gera in particular provides a comprehensive discussion of the influence of Socratic dialogues on the *Cyropaedia* (Gera 1993, 26 ff.). Ragnar Höistad's *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*, also provides a valuable examination of the links between what is known of Antisthenes' work on Cyrus with Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (Höistad 1948, 73 ff.), and rejects the idea of Xenophon closely depending on Antisthenes' work (*ibid.*, 78). I have therefore concentrated on four Greek sources, as well as referring to Near Eastern sources, which can confidently be said to have influenced the composition of the *Cyropaedia*, and have sought to expand on the points made by Due and Gera where necessary and have suggested other parallels that are not mentioned in their works.

(i) Near Eastern Sources

In a section devoted to examining Greek literary influences on the *Cyropaedia* it is also necessary to acknowledge the possible existence of other, non-Greek, traditions in the work. Scholars have sought to find Persian and Near Eastern sources for the *Cyropaedia* (see above section C), citing Xenophon's time spent in the Persian Empire, his acquaintance with Cyrus the Younger and with some of the Persian nobility, and his accurate and innovative use of Persian terminology such as *paradeisos* in his description of the Persian court and administration of the Empire, as proof of the genuinely Oriental character of the work. In *Persian Paideia and Greek Historia. An interpretation of the Cyropaedia of Xenophon. Book One*, Joan M. Todd uses epigraphic and archaeological evidence in support of her belief that Xenophon's depiction of court life in Persia and Media and of Persian education was based largely on first-hand knowledge of Persia and of Near Eastern sources. Todd's emphasis on the authentic Oriental character of the *Cyropaedia* has been further developed by Steven Hirsch in *The Friendship of the Barbarians*.

There is indeed, particularly in Book 8, which describes the principles and methods which Cyrus used to administer his empire, some valuable information which contributes to our knowledge of the structure and intricacies of later Achaemenid bureaucracy. We can only guess at the extent of Xenophon's personal knowledge of Persian language, history and lore from his time spent soldiering in Asia Minor and the Near East. Phrases like "ἐτι καὶ νῦν" regularly crop up in the narrative to draw parallels and contrasts with the Persian practices of Cyrus' day and of Xenophon's time, which Due concludes are used "to assimilate the *Cyropaedia* to historical writing".⁴⁶ Yet these parallels reveal little of the extent of Xenophon's actual knowledge of Persia or of his desire to use it in the *Cyropaedia*, and, whatever he knew about Near Eastern sources, he did not use them accurately to recreate the historical past.⁴⁷ Gera and Hirsch assume

⁴⁶ See Due 1989, 33-38 & 1.1.4 in the Commentary on Book 1.

⁴⁷ Stadter 1991, 461-464.

that Xenophon did not use written sources, though he would have had access to oral Persian tales celebrating the deeds of Cyrus.⁴⁸ He makes few references to the existence of such sources. He refers implicitly to barbarian sources for the *Cyropaedia* at four points in the narrative (1.4.27, 8.5.28, 8.6.16 & 8.6.20) and mentions Cyrus' fame being celebrated by the barbarians in story and in song, *logos kai ᾠδῇ* (1.2.1 & 1.4.25). The implicit references to Near Eastern sources in Books 1 and 8 are prefaced by anonymous source attributions: Xenophon writes of the *paidikos logos* about Cyrus' Median admirer, and another about the beauty of Cyrus' wife, and uses the phrases “ὥς φάσι”, and “λέγεται”. Hirsch comments that “Xenophon's frequent citation of oral tradition among the barbarians is reminiscent of Herodotus”,⁴⁹ however, such citations should not automatically be assumed to refer to genuine Near Eastern sources. Detlev Fehling in his work on Herodotus' source citations, *Herodotus and his 'Sources'*, shows that these same terms are associated with fictive authorities, and provides several examples of anonymous source citations being used in this way to create an overall source fiction for the whole work, not just by Herodotus but in other Greek authors, including Xenophon.⁵⁰

The allusions to the *logoi* and *ᾠδαι* of the barbarians are not reliable pointers to Xenophon's use of Near Eastern sources. Strabo, in his account of Persia reveals that the Persians, as part of their education, celebrate the deeds of the gods and the best men either ‘with or without song’ (*Geog.* 15.3.18).⁵¹ In the Persia of the *Cyropaedia*

⁴⁸ Gera 1993, 13 ff. & Hirsch 1985, 68 ff. Gera proceeds to argue that some kind of Persian epic, including stories of Cyrus, would have been in existence at the time when Xenophon wrote the *Cyropaedia*, and that Xenophon would probably have known parts of it. Such an argument rests entirely on drawing parallels with later Iranian literature, notably the eleventh century epic the *Shahnamah*, and remains entirely conjectural, as she herself admits. See Cook 1983, 11 ff. for an analysis of Near Eastern written sources.

⁴⁹ Hirsch 1985, 68.

⁵⁰ Fehling 1989, 157 f. & 164.

⁵¹ The passage is included in Stoneman's brief commentary (Stoneman 1992, 273).

Xenophon makes no mention of such a practice in his account of Persian education, although the idea of reverence for the past does appear in Cyrus' final speech. The dying king exhorts his two sons to heed the advice he has just given them on how to behave towards one another and to mankind, or, if it is not sufficient, to look to the past as it is the best teacher,

καὶ παρὰ τῶν προγεγενημένων μανθάνετε· αὕτη γὰρ ἀρίστη διδασκαλία. *Cyr.*
8.7.24

This sentiment informs the presentation of the past, in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and in the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, as a valuable source of material from which moral and practical lessons can be learned. By contrast, in the *Cyropaedia*, Xenophon is projecting the *logoi* and *ᾄδαι* of the Greeks onto a fictional character operating in a quasi-historical background. He is concerned with depicting the life and times of Cyrus as seen from a Greek perspective rather than creating a historical narrative based on Persian stories and songs. His priorities are reflected in the final speech of Cyrus (see Appendix C). The words of wisdom to his sons, which they fail to heed, are given more importance in terms of narrative length and emphasis than the brief mention of the experience of the Persians in the past. Indeed, Cyrus' reference to the history of the Persians is ironic, as he himself had once implicitly criticised the deeds of his ancestors (1.5.8 ff.).

Xenophon seems to be simply acknowledging the existence of Persian songs and stories on Cyrus in two brief references in Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia*. The formulaic nature of these references adds to the modern reader's impression that Xenophon wrote the *Cyropaedia* to accommodate Greek perceptions of the Near East and that he used Greek values as the basis for constructing an essentially fictive account of the life of Cyrus. This impression is confirmed in Book 2 of the *Cyropaedia*; during a discussion at Cyrus' dinner table on the merits of making men laugh or cry one of Cyrus' captains refers to authors, "λογοποιοῦντες", who invent piteous things in stories and songs to make one cry,

ὥσπερ ἔνιοι καὶ ἐν ᾠδαῖς καὶ ἐν λόγοις οἰκτρὰ ἅττα λογοποιοῦντες εἰς δάκρυα πειρῶνται ἄγειν. *Cyr.* 2.2.13

Celebration of men, from the heroic past and the present, in stories and songs, formed the basis of Pindar's encomiastic poetry,⁵² and Xenophon, in referring to the stories and songs of barbarians, is acknowledging the Greek tradition of praise for mythical and historical figures who have proved themselves in word and deed to be worthy of such praise and is equating Cyrus with such men in terms to which his readership can relate. Cyrus has been chosen by Xenophon to be a heroic *paradeigma* (see above Introduction B), in the words of Phoenix in the *Iliad*, 'to be both a speaker of words and doer of deeds'.⁵³

(ii) Homer

The influence of Homer on Greek literature is always acknowledged to be immense. His works were particularly prized for their educational value,⁵⁴ and in the *Cyropaedia*, a work devoted to the *paideia* of a young man who proves himself in battle, there are Homeric elements which would have been recognisable to the Greeks, with their extensive knowledge of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The Homeric nature of Cyrus' deeds would have been recognised by men such as Niceratus, one of the characters in Xenophon's *Symposium*, who was compelled by his father to learn the two epics by heart so that he might become a good man (*Symp.* 3.5) and who proclaims the virtues of the two works,

ἴστε γὰρ δὴπου ὅτι Ὅμηρος ὁ σοφώτατος πεποίηκε σχεδὸν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων. ὅστις ἂν οὖν ὑμῶν βούληται ἢ οἰκονομικὸς ἢ δημηγορικὸς ἢ στρατηγικὸς γενέσθαι ἢ ὁμοίως Ἀχιλλεῖ ἢ Αἴαντι ἢ Νέστορι ἢ Ὀδυσσεῖ, ἐμὲ θεραπευέτω. ἐγὼ γὰρ ταῦτα πάντα ἐπίσταμαι. *Symp.* 4.6

For I am sure that you know that Homer, the wisest of men, has something to say on virtually every aspect of human life. So if anyone is wanting to be knowledgeable about household management or public speaking or generalship or to be like Achilles or Ajax

⁵² E.g. Pindar *P.* 1.92-94, *N.* 6.30-31 & *N.* 11.17-18.

⁵³ *Il.* 9.443; see Jaeger 1939, I, 8 for a discussion of the significance of this passage in Homer.

⁵⁴ See Jaeger 1939, I, 35 f.

Niceratus' self-professed knowledge of Homer's works and his simple faith in their wide-ranging educational worth engenders a sarcastic response from Antisthenes, another of the guests at the banquet. Antisthenes asks whether he knows how to act like a king, βασιλεύειν, in view of Homer's praise of Agamemnon as a 'good king and mighty warrior', to which Niceratus replies in the affirmative. This passage is often used as evidence of the importance of Homer in Athenian, and by implication Greek, education; it is also important in assessing Xenophon's own view of Homer which he has chosen to voice through the unknown figure of Niceratus.

The narrative of the *Cyropaedia* would satisfy the demands of both Niceratus and Antisthenes, and its hero possesses attributes which both men could admire. The achievements of Xenophon's Cyrus make him the embodiment of Homer's 'good king and mighty warrior'. He possesses all the talents that Niceratus claims to know about: he is able to manage not just a household but a vast empire of different peoples, who are kept in check through awe of him (1.1.5); he is skilled in the art of public speaking, as he demonstrates when reforming his army: and his skill as a general renders him invincible against his enemies. Xenophon portrays him as a composite Homeric hero; as fierce in battle and pre-eminent amongst men as Achilles or Hector, as brave as Ajax, as wise as Nestor, and as crafty as Odysseus.

The content of the *Cyropaedia*, with its accent on war and leadership, lends itself to elements of Homeric narrative. Xenophon's similes in the hunting and battle scenes of the *Cyropaedia* are Homeric in style and content. Furthermore, certain passages describing incidents of Cyrus' childhood *paideia* appear to be composed with Homer specifically in mind. The Homeric epics also provide us with the earliest portrayals of childhood in the ancient world through the characters of the infant Astyanax in the *Iliad*, and, at the opposite end of scale, Telemachus, the youth approaching manhood in the *Odyssey*. Xenophon, in his detailed and perceptive picture of Cyrus' childhood, chooses to concentrate on the middle period of childhood when Cyrus is well past the infant stage, but is still a *pais* in his early teens who has yet to be admitted to the class of youths, *ephēboi*, which is open to boys of sixteen or seventeen years of age (1.2.8).

Cyrus spends this period of his life away from the confines of the Persian royal palace and the conventional Persian *paideia*, having been taken away by his mother to visit her father Astyages, king of the Medes. The opulence and openness of the Median court initially amazes the boy accustomed to the austere Persian lifestyle, but he quickly adapts to life in Media and is able to persuade his mother to allow him to stay there when she leaves for Persia (1.3.15-18).

Cyrus is eager to stay in Media because he revels in the freedom he is able to enjoy under his doting grandfather's tutelage, in particular he is overjoyed to have the opportunity to go hunting.⁵⁵ Xenophon's vivid description of Cyrus' first hunt in the wilds of Media has parallels, in the background to the story and the actual hunt itself, with Odysseus' account in Book 19 of the *Odyssey* of visiting his grandfather, Autolycus, and of being allowed to take part in a boar-hunt on Mt. Parnassus. Homer uses 'flashback' technique to describe how Odysseus, now back in his own palace under the guise of a beggar, has a scar on his knee which betrays his real identity to his old nurse Eurycleia when she washes him. The story of how Odysseus received the scar is the premise for a digression in the narrative, dealing with the significant role played by Odysseus' maternal grandfather, Autolycus, in his upbringing. Autolycus chooses the name for his recently born grandson and promises him a share of his goods when he is of the right age to visit Parnassus, "ὅπποτ' ἂν ἡβήσας μητρῷον ἐς μέγα δῶμα ἔλθῃ Παρνησόνδ'" (*Od.* 19.410-411).

The character of Autolycus, the self-serving trickster, has been regarded as "the prototype of Odysseus' personality seen in its most negative aspect".⁵⁶ When Odysseus arrives at Parnassus to receive his gifts, "ἀγλαὰ δῶρα" (*ibid.*, 413), he is treated with honour and generosity by Autolycus and his family. Astyages has a similar role to Autolycus in the *Cyropaedia* as a negative prototype of the adult Cyrus; he lavishes gifts and attention on Cyrus and exerts considerable influence on his grandson. Cyrus

⁵⁵ See Synopses to chapters 3 & 4 in the Commentary for more detailed discussion of the hunting passages.

⁵⁶ Russo *et al.* 1992, III, 96.

displays certain traits of his character when he reaches maturity, assuming what he perceives to be the positive aspects of his grandfather's persona. He adopts Median dress, having been influenced by seeing his grandfather's use of cosmetics to enhance his appearance and inspire respect among others (8.1.40-1); he seeks to win favour through generosity just as Astyages secured his admiration through gifts and favours (8.2.7); and, once in power, he practises the Median style of despotic kingship in seclusion from his subjects, but avoids the indulgence and love of excess which characterises Astyages' own court and is manifested in the character of Astyages' own son Cyaxares.

When Odysseus goes off hunting on foot with Autolycus' sons on the mountain, the hounds soon track down the lair of a mighty boar, which sallies forth against the huntsmen. Odysseus is the first to react, rushing forward in his eagerness to strike the boar with his spear,

ὁ δ' ἄρα πρῶτιστος Ὀδυσσεὺς
ἔσσυτ' ἀνασχόμενος δολιχὸν δόρυ χειρὶ παχείῃ,
οὐτάμεναι μεμαῶς. *Od.* 19.447-449

Homer emphasises that the young Odysseus acts impulsively, “μεμαῶς”, and recklessly, as he meets the boar's charge. He kills the boar but in the process his knee is gashed by the animal's tusk, leaving the scar, which, many years later, Eurycleia recognises.

Odysseus pays a price, albeit a minor one, for his ardour in the hunt, whereas Cyrus emerges unscathed from indulging in his passion for hunting. Having seen his grandson kill all the wild animals in his *paradeisos* through his love of the sport (1.4.5), Astyages gives in to Cyrus' desire to hunt in the wild and grants him permission to go off in the company of his son Cyaxares and some guards, who are to protect the boy from any dangerous wild beasts and places. Cyrus' impatient and impulsive nature translates itself into a reckless disregard of danger that enables him to kill single-handedly a deer and a boar. Not even a rebuke from his uncle Cyaxares for his rash conduct can spoil Cyrus' joy in his achievement, and he has the audacity to ask if he can take back his two kills, the evidence of his foolhardiness, to show his grandfather (1.4.9). Cyrus is subsequently able to persuade his grandfather to take him on another

larger hunt along with his friends and Astyages takes pleasure in watching Cyrus' unrestrained glee in chasing down animals. The modest young boy is transformed into a predatory animal, Xenophon likening his cries to the yelping of a young hound, "ὥσπερ σκύλακι γενναίῳ ἀνακλάζοντι" (1.4.15).

The Homeric themes of the boar hunt and the unrestrained behaviour in the face of danger are combined in the next hunting episode depicted by Xenophon, when Cyrus is fast approaching the age of a Persian *ephēbos*, although on this occasion his quarry are not wild animals but men (1.4.16 ff.). Cyrus gains his first experience of combat when his future rival the Assyrian prince illicitly crosses the Median border on a hunting trip, and Astyages marches out with a substantial force to drive out the invaders. Cyrus appears, uninvited, at his grandfather's side, but Astyages does not send the boy away. Once again the Median king bows to the boy's zest for action and allows him to accompany his force, little realising that not only will Cyrus dictate the battle plan against the Assyrian raiders, he will also be actively involved in the fighting. Cyrus' enthusiasm for the chase in hunting is translated into a bloodthirsty piece of derring-do, and he leaves his grandfather's side, without asking for his permission, to join his uncle in charging at the enemy. At this point Xenophon uses a simile decidedly Homeric in content and style, which refers back to the two previous hunting scenes, to describe the young prince's headlong pursuit of the enemy,

ὥσπερ δὲ κύων γενναῖος ἄπειρος ἀπρονοήτως φέρεται πρὸς κάπρον, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Κύρος ἐφέρετο, μόνον ὁρῶν τὸ παῖειν τὸν ἀλίσκόμενον, ἄλλο δ' οὐδὲν προνοῶν. *Cyr.* 1.4.21

Just as a well-bred but inexperienced hound hurls itself recklessly upon a boar, so Cyrus was carried away, looking only to strike down anyone caught in his path, and thinking of nothing else.

The simile echoes Cyrus' first hunting feat against the boar and once again Cyrus is likened to a predatory hound, although the noble young puppy, σκύλαξ, of the second hunting trip has been transformed into full-grown hunting dog, κύων, albeit an inexperienced one, and once again he takes off blindly in pursuit. The simile of the hunting hound pursuing his prey appears several times in the *Iliad*: Hector in pursuit of the Achaeans is likened to a dog snapping at the heels of a boar or lion (*Il.* 8.338); Odysseus and Diomedes pursue the Trojan spy Dolon like two hounds after a deer

or hare (*Il.* 10.360); Antilochus rushes at Melanippus like a dog pouncing on a stricken fawn (*Il.* 15.479); and the Trojans rushing in on the Achaeans bearing Patroclus' body away from the battlefield are compared to hounds closing in on a stricken boar (*Il.* 17.725). Another effective use of a simile in a battlefield scene in the *Cyropaedia* occurs when the Assyrian ally of Cyrus, Gadatas, is nearly betrayed into the hands of the Assyrian prince. His troops and himself are subsequently pursued and overtaken by the enemy, until Cyrus and his army appear to save them. The actions of the exhausted Gadatas and his men, who are overjoyed and summon extra strength to rush towards the sanctuary of Cyrus' army, are likened to that of men in a ship who put into a harbour out of a storm (5.4.6). The scene also recalls the frantic flight of the Trojans before Achilles in Book 21 of the *Iliad*, and their sense of relief as they pile in through the city gates.

The theme of the young Cyrus' reckless conduct is reminiscent of Homer's treatment of Hector's efforts in defence of his city, which cause his wife to warn him that his own strength will kill him, "φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος" (*Il.* 6.407). Hector the adult warrior in his battle-fury is compared to a mighty boar in a long simile in Book 12, when he storms the ditch surrounding the Greek ships (*Il.* 12.40-48). He behaves like the boar at bay which turns on his pursuers, confident of his strength and oblivious to the danger that surrounds him, and is killed by his own courage. The Trojan hero eventually pays the ultimate price for his rashness on the battlefield.⁵⁷ Xenophon's Cyrus will live to fight another day when he will not be so reckless, though during his first taste of battle he does not let caution spoil his enjoyment. He is unable to be silent as in his hunting trips, but this time he shouts to his uncle, not through thrill of the chase but enjoyment of battle, "ὕπὸ τῆς χαρμονῆς ἀνακαλῶν τὸν θεῖον" (1.4.22), and succeeds in putting the enemy to flight. Cyrus' joy, χαρμονή, recalls the Homeric hero's lust for battle, χάρμη, which comes to him or leaves him at crucial moments on the battlefield. This first experience of *charmē* is an important step in the transition of Cyrus the impulsive boy into Cyrus the warrior prince, and it reappears in his first battle against the Assyrians, when he forgets to lead his army at a measured pace but joins the rest of his men, who

⁵⁷ Cf. Xenophon's description in the *Anabasis* of the reckless behaviour of Cyrus the Younger at the battle of Cunaxa (*An.* 1.8.24 ff).

are filled with the same spirit of courage, enthusiasm and eagerness, προθυμία, μένος and τὸ σπεύδειν, in running at the enemy (3.3.62).

Such warlike feelings are alien to the sensibilities of the effeminate Medes, and, after the Assyrian trespassers have been quickly repelled, Astyages is rendered speechless by the transformation in Cyrus from demure grandson into battle-crazed warrior,

Ἐκ τοῦτο δὴ ἀνήγαγεν ὁ Ἀστυάγης, μάλα χαίρων καὶ τῇ ἱπποκρατίᾳ καὶ τὸν Κῦρον οὐκ ἔχων ὃ τι χρὴ λέγειν αἴτιον μὲν ὄντα εἰδὼς τοῦ ἔργου, μαινόμενον δὲ γινώσκων τῇ τόμλμῃ. *Cyr.* 1.4.24

After this Astyages withdrew, greatly pleased with the victory of his cavalry, but at the same time not knowing what he should say to Cyrus; for Astyages knew that the latter was responsible for the victory, but he also observed that Cyrus was crazed with his own daring.

Xenophon's use of "μαινόμενον" to describe Cyrus' craze for battle recalls the fury of Homeric heroes on the battlefield, most notably when Hector is driven on to attack the Greek ships by Zeus, even though he is already maddened by battle without the god's help,

τὰ φρονέων νήεσσιν ἐπὶ γλαφυρῇσιν ἔγειρεν
Ἴκτορα Πριαμίδην μάλα περ μεμαῶτα καὶ αὐτόν.
μαίνεται δ' ὥς ὅτ' Ἄρης ἐγγέσπαλος ἢ ὅλοδν πῦρ
οὔρεσι μαίνεται. *Il.* 15.603-606

Xenophon continues with this Homeric theme as the effects of Cyrus' battle fury cause him to ride around alone and gloat over the corpses of the enemy, much to his grandfather's displeasure (1.4.24). In the *Odyssey* the nurse Eurycleia is tempted to do the same after the suitors have been slain in the great hall, but Odysseus rebukes her, warning her of the impiety of gloating over the slain (*Od.* 22.412).

As a result of Cyrus' extraordinary deeds in Media his name is on everyone's lips and he becomes celebrated in story and song (1.4.25). Although he is still a boy, Cyrus has achieved an heroic status amongst the Medes. His deeds on the battlefield are akin to the youthful *aristeia* of Nestor in the war of the Pylians against the Epeians, which he describes to Patroclus in Book 11 of the *Iliad*. Nestor was considered old enough to go on a cattle raid, but when the time came for a full scale battle his father Neleus would not allow him to be armed and had hidden his horses, considering him too young

and unskilled in the art of warfare (*Il.* 11.717-719). Nestor goes against his father's advice and joins the Pylians, distinguishing himself in battle earning the praise of the Achaeans alongside Zeus,

πάντες δ' εὐχετόωντο θεῶν Διὶ Νέστορι τ' ἀνδρῶν. *Il.* 11.761

Cyrus' youthful *aristeia* proves to be the precursor of further battlefield success against the Assyrians and their allies.⁵⁸

Xenophon's allusions to scenes from the Homeric epics in the *Cyropaedia* are not confined to his description of Cyrus' childhood. The standard scene in the *Iliad* of Agamemnon summoning his troops to assembly to discuss important matters is echoed in Cyrus' assembly of his troops in Book 2 to vote on his reform of the army. One of his captains, Chrysantas, speaks out in favour of his proposal in order to ensure its success. Just as Odysseus lends valuable support to Agamemnon in the aftermath of the assembly in Book 2 of the *Iliad*, so Chrysantas helps Cyrus at a critical point in the debate and he is appropriately described as being like Odysseus, for what he lacks in physical stature he makes up for in intelligence,

ἄνθρωπος οὐτε μέγας οὐτε ἰσχυρὸς ἰδεῖν, φρονήσει δὲ διαφέρων. *Cyr.* 2.2.5

The funeral games of Book 23 of the *Iliad* are also alluded to when Cyrus holds games with prizes for his troops (8.2.26 & 8.3.33). During the second occasion an episode dealing with the unlikely friendship and seemingly unequal exchange of gifts between the Persian commoner Pheraulas and a Sacian horseman recalls the meeting of Glaucus and Diomedes in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 6.119 ff.).

Book 6 of the *Iliad* also provides inspiration for one of the most celebrated scenes in the *Cyropaedia*, Abradatas' final farewell to his wife Panthea (6.4.1 ff.) echoes the parting scene of Hector and Andromache (*Il.* 6.399 ff.).⁵⁹ There is a further Homeric

⁵⁸ See Howie 1996, 196 ff. for discussion of the *aristeia* in Homer and Xenophon.

⁵⁹ See Delebecque 1978, 36 n., Tatum 1989, 179 f., Gera 1993, 235 ff. & Howie 1996, 207 ff. for analyses of the Homeric parallels in this scene of the *Cyropaedia*. Gera also notes that Panthea in this scene also resembles Darius' wife, Atossa, in Book 3 of Herodotus' work (Gera 1993, 237).

parallel to this scene that implicitly links the doomed Abradatas to first Patroclus, then Hector, in Books 16-17 of the *Iliad*. Panthea's gift of new golden armour and a purple tunic for Abradatas, which is received as an unexpected and welcome present by her grateful husband, recalls Thetis' procuring of new armour for Achilles. The theme of the hero wearing new armour, and by doing so going against the natural order of things, οὐ κατὰ κόσμον - the armour acting as a harbinger of the death of the wearer - is played out in the *Iliad* initially through the character of Patroclus, then Hector, both of them wearing Achilles' old armour and being subsequently killed on the battlefield. When Hector exults in putting on Achilles' armour, having stripped it from Patroclus' corpse, Zeus is moved to lament for Hector's ignorance of his own impending death. In taking the armour, which he was not supposed to do, Hector unwittingly confirms his own doom,

τεύχεα δ' οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἀπὸ κρατός τε καὶ ὤμων
εἶλεν. *Il.* 17.205

Xenophon cleverly incorporates the theme into Abradatas' reaction to his new armour, playing on the dual meaning of *kosmos* as the natural order of things and as decorations signifying honour, when he asks his wife whether she had destroyed her own jewels, “τὸν σαυτῆς κόσμον”, to make his new armour (6.4.3). Panthea affectionately replies that she has not destroyed him, her most precious jewel of all, for he, if he appears to others as he does to her, will be her loveliest jewel, “μέγιστος κόσμος” (6.4.3). Abradatas is for her the embodiment of all that is honourable and creditable in her life and she wishes to convey this pride in him through the gift of the golden armour, which in its ostentation stands in sharp contrast to the uniformity of Cyrus' bronze-clad Persians. The tragic irony behind the exchange is that she is about to lose her most precious jewel on the battlefield of Sardis. Her husband's death destroys her most precious jewel and the order of her life, which leads to self-recrimination and her own suicide (7.3.10-14).

These examples of Homeric influence on the work show that the similes and concentration on scenes of daring and pathos, which might seem to be uncharacteristic poetic flights of fancy in the otherwise simple, unadorned prose of Xenophon, are verbal

echoes of scenes and expressions which the average Greek well-versed in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, if not to the extent of Niceratus, would have recognised and appreciated. Not only is the author demonstrating his own erudition, he is elevating his hero and other worthy characters in the *Cyropaedia* to the ranks of the Homeric hero by making them display similar traits and undergo similar experiences as these renowned mythical figures.

(iii) Wisdom literature

All Xenophon's books are more or less dominated by the desire to educate. That characteristic is not merely a concession to his age. It is a spontaneous expression of his nature.⁶⁰

In Book 8 of the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon describes at length a banquet held to celebrate Cyrus' victories, to which Cyrus' most loyal friends are invited, including the Assyrian elder Gobryas. He had previously entrusted his daughter to Cyrus' care in the hope of finding a suitable marriage for her, as part of the pact he had made with Cyrus (7.2.7). In the course of some light-hearted conversation Cyrus asks Gobryas whether he is more ready to accept one of Cyrus' Persian friends as a suitor now, than when he first joined Cyrus (8.4.13). At that time he had been disconcerted by the Persians' disregard for his material wealth and had thought them less refined than his own people. However, his attitude has changed, and he declares that he is much more willing to countenance the idea because he has been impressed by the Persians' ability to bear their good fortune no less well than their hard work and times of danger (8.4.14). He concludes his observation on the Persians with the truism that good fortune can lead to *hybris* for most men while misfortune inspires in all men self-control *sōphrosynē* (*ibid.*). Cyrus then asks Hystaspas, one of the Persian captains who has set his heart on Gobryas' daughter, whether he has heard Gobryas' saying, "Γωβρύου τὸ ῥῆμα" (8.4.15). Hystaspas replies in the affirmative, remarking that he values such words of wisdom more than any wealth Gobryas might possess. The Assyrian responds by promising him

⁶⁰ Jaeger 1945, III, 159.

that he has many of such truisms written down, “πολλά γε μοί ἐστι τοιαῦτα συγγεγραμμένα” (8.4.16).

What appears to be a relatively trivial scene is in fact of great importance in assessing the influence of wisdom, or gnostic, literature on the *Cyropaedia*, Xenophon seems to be referring here to the existence of collections of wise sayings in the Middle East, in which we can see the roots of Greek wisdom literature. In the Greek world collections of aphorisms, known as γνῶμολογία, were a feature of the Byzantine age, most notably in the work of Stobaeus, but probably dated back to early fourth century Athens, the time of Xenophon.⁶¹ The *Cyropaedia* does contain passages of gnostic wisdom which suggest that Xenophon was acquainted with the idea of education by *gnōmologia*.

As prose superseded verse as the principal form of philosophic expression in Greek literature, gnostic wisdom was no longer confined to the format of a succession of self-contained statements and the delineation between practical and ethical wisdom became blurred.⁶² Rudiments of wisdom were incorporated into the framework of a story, one of the most notable examples being the story of Croesus in Book 1 of Herodotus' work, when Solon lectures the king of Lydia on what constitutes a *bios eudaimōn*, and his words are proved true by Croesus' subsequent misadventures. Croesus also receives good advice from one of the Sages of the Greek world, either Bias of Priene or Pittacus of Mytilene, and from one of his Lydian subjects, Sandanis, before he in turn, after defeat, becomes a wise advisor to his master Cyrus of Persia. Xenophon himself realised the importance of the downfall of Croesus in Greek accounts of Cyrus' life and the place of Croesus in the tradition of wisdom literature. He too depicts a meeting between Cyrus and the captive Lydian king in Book 7 of the *Cyropaedia*, and Cyrus' opening words to the man who has recently been one of his main enemies are

⁶¹ Barns 1950, 126 ff. & 1951, 1 ff.

⁶² See Gera 1993, 50 f. for a history of early verse works of moral instruction, *hypothēkai*; she correctly regards the conversation between Cyrus and Cambyses in chapter 6 of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* as belonging to the tradition of this kind of literature.

significantly followed by a request for advice (7.2.10). Croesus' misfortunes and fall from grace with Apollo have qualified him in Cyrus' opinion to be a useful source of wisdom and Croesus dutifully supplies Cyrus with a gnomic response from the Delphic oracle, appropriately in one hexameter line, which refers to the inscription on the temple of Apollo,

Σαυτὸν γινώσκων εὐδαίμων Κροῖσε περάσεις. *Cyr.* 7.2.20
Know yourself, Croesus, and you will achieve good fortune.

Plato discusses in the *Hippias Major* the question of combining practical advice on public matters, τὰ κοινά, and private matters, τὰ ἴδια, by making a traditional contrast between intellectuals and men of action (*Hp. Ma.* 281D). The contrast serves to highlight the change in attitudes to wisdom literature in the fifth and fourth centuries, whereby gnomic wisdom was no longer the preserve of poets who were not in sympathy with the life of the *polis*, such as the Boeotian farmer Hesiod and the disgruntled aristocrat Theognis, but included the soldier and the statesman. Hippias is mentioned in another Platonic dialogue, the *Phaedrus*, where Socrates discusses the art of rhetoric with Phaedrus and pokes fun at teachers of rhetoric such as Hippias and Polus, pupil of Licymnius whose writing style included the affectation of *gnōmologia* (*Phdr.* 267C). Plato, in dismissing this and other stylistic components of rhetoric, reflects the shift in emphasis in wisdom literature from combining ethical maxims with practical wisdom relevant to contemporary life, which men of action were better qualified to write.

Xenophon was just such a man of action. He witnessed and was actively involved in some of the major events at the end of the fifth and beginning of the fourth century, as a military commander in the aftermath of Cyrus the Younger's unsuccessful attempt to remove his brother from the throne of Persia and in the Spartan king Agesilaus' campaigns in Asia Minor. On approaching manhood, he, like a number of future influential Athenians, came under the spell of the teaching of Socrates. The Athenian philosopher was far from being a dispenser of simple gnomic wisdom, but both

Xenophon and Plato depicted him as being well-versed in the works of gnomic poets.⁶³

Xenophon, like Plato, recognises the importance of prudent and selective use of *gnōmai*, and in the *Memorabilia* Xenophon depicts Socrates using selected *gnōmai* for educational purposes (*Mem.* 1.2.56 ff.). However, in contrast to Plato, he is ready to use the Homeric epics as a source of moral examples, *paradeigmata* (*ibid.* & *Symp.* 8.30-31). He subtly refers to the old tradition of wisdom literature whilst maintaining the accent on practical advice, recognising that this old tradition was invaluable for expressing his desire to educate. Of all his works, three of them could be classed as works of advice, in which the enactment of practical wisdom is seen as reinforcing ethical beliefs, the *Hipparchicus*, *Peri Hippikēs*, and the *Cynegeticus*. The first two are technical treatises, seemingly aimed at a select readership, an educated and wealthy élite who could afford to maintain horses. The *Cynegeticus* is somewhat different. Instead of containing purely prescriptive narrative there is also a strong descriptive element in the work and a long preface which lists famous mythical hunters who were pupils of the centaur Cheiron, an important figure in Greek wisdom literature. Xenophon also includes a final chapter, which, apparently out of character with the rest of the work, is an attack on the sophists of the fourth century. The preface and the rhetoric of the final chapter have long been regarded as interpolations and the authorship and date of the work have been questioned, but these assumptions have been convincingly challenged in an article by Gray.⁶⁴ She shows that the *Cynegeticus* is not so much a technical treatise as a work of advice, *paraenesis*, a moral treatise with technical instruction. Taking Isocrates' Cyprian Orations, in particular the works *Nicocles* and *To Demonicus*, as models of this kind of literature, she also demonstrates that the structure of the work resembles Hesiod's *Works and Days* in its clearly structured transitions from elaborate preface on mythological subjects, to practical advice and finally, in the last chapter, warnings as to ethical conduct.

⁶³ E.g. Plato's *Meno*, where Socrates quotes Pindar and Theognis (*Men.* 76D & 95D), and Xenophon's *Symposium*, where Socrates quotes Theognis (*Symp.* 2.4).

⁶⁴ Gray 1985, 156-172.

There is also criticism of sophists' misuse of maxims in the final chapter of the *Cynegeticus*. Xenophon complains that they do not use maxims in the correct manner, namely as a means of teaching virtue, *aretē*, to young men (*Cyn.* 13.3 ff.). He speaks as the interested individual, “ἐγὼ δὲ ἰδιώτης μὲν εἰμι” (*ibid.*), the layman who seeks to articulate the ideas that those who are well educated in virtue think and need to hear (*ibid.*). Words are not sufficient to educate, but maxims can be if used correctly,

ὀνόματα μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἂν παιδεύσειαν, γινῶμαι δέ εἰ καλῶς ἔχοιεν. *Cyn.* 13.5-6

Xenophon is thus preaching to the converted. His maxims are used to reassert rather than challenge accepted opinions, a function which Aristotle acknowledges in a passage in his *Rhetoric* on *gnōmologia* (*Rhet.* 1394A-1395B). He notes that maxims are useful to speakers and says that one should ‘hunt for maxims’ as hearers are pleased to hear in general terms an opinion they have specifically formed. But the more important advantage of *gnōmai*, Aristotle tells us, is that they make speeches ethical, “ἠθικοὺς γὰρ ποιεῖ τοὺς λόγους”; they serve to make the moral purpose of the speech clear, and in turn illustrate the moral preferences of the speaker and his good character (*Rhet.* 1395B). Just like Aristotle’s would-be rhetorician Xenophon articulates the practical and ethical ideas of those who are well educated and have fixed notions about what constitutes virtue. The summary of the qualities of Agesilaus in his *encomium* of the Spartan king is delivered as a series of maxims, in order that the praise of his *aretē* may be more easily remembered, “ὥς ἂν ὁ ἔπαινος εὐμνημονεστέρως ἔχη” (*Ages.* 11.1 ff.). Gray notes that “a parainesis demanded conventional moral attitudes from the writer, which need not reflect his own beliefs”.⁶⁵ Whether or not the beliefs expressed in the *Cyropaedia* corresponded to Xenophon’s own beliefs, and there is no reason to suppose that they do not, by reflecting conventional morality in his use of maxims Xenophon confirms his own suitability for the role of dispenser of advice and wisdom. He also reveals his own good character to readers of the work.

Having examined the history of wisdom literature and its overall influence on

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 162.

Xenophon's works, it is time to focus on the *Cyropaedia* and assess the influence of gnomic tradition on it, a tradition which is clearly present on both a practical and ethical level. Although the work is based on the life of an exceptional leader, a foreign king whose exploits were already passing into the realm of myth, there is still the same universality of the wisdom in this account of the words and deeds of a special individual which characterises the work of the early Greek poets. As in his three 'technical' treatises, Xenophon is to some extent reiterating certain beliefs, which those who have undergone the same education and who share the same ethical attitude as he, hold dear. Moreover, whilst confirming that he is morally and educationally qualified to deliver advice to his readership, he also gives advice on more practical matters which stem from his own wide-ranging military experience. Not only are there short, pithy *rhēmata* of the kind that Gobryas delivers (see above), there are also lengthy, descriptive passages of advice focusing on military affairs such as in Book 8 (8.5.2-16), where Xenophon describes how Cyrus organised his army on the march and in setting up camp, Cyrus' army acting as a microcosm of society, being in need of order and firm control.

In chapter 6 of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon's depiction of the scene with Cyrus and Cambyses illustrates clearly the author's linking of the practical and the ethical to produce, within the overall structure of the work, a self-contained *paraenesis*.⁶⁶ The paraenetic conversation between paternal figure and son as the latter goes off to Media to face war with the Assyrians and to face his own destiny, has a number of parallels in previous Greek literature. Cambyses acts as a wise advisor in the style of figures such as Nestor and Mentor in the Homeric epics and Croesus, Solon and Artabanus in Herodotus.⁶⁷ Furthermore, Xenophon has provided the kind of dramatic setting for the impartation of advice, the father passing on his wisdom to his son, which harks back to Hesiod and to Near Eastern roots of wisdom literature. In the *Cyropaedia* the father subjects the boy to a comprehensive and stern examination of his ideas and beliefs, making Cyrus first reveal details of his education and then correcting what he

⁶⁶ For an analysis of the scene see Synopsis to Chapter 6 of the Commentary.

⁶⁷ See Lattimore 1939, 24 ff.

thinks to be complacent and mistaken assumptions, before giving his son the benefit of his advice.

The whole episode can be seen as a ‘ring composition’, beginning and ending with the idea of the importance of religious piety and of interpreting correctly omens from the gods.⁶⁸ The same themes occur in the *Cynegeticus*, which begins and ends with strictures on the gods and piety, and, looking at an earlier model of this kind of literature, Hesiod’s *Works and Days* ends with praise of the man who is “εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὀλβιος”, who does not offend the gods and observes omens (*WD* 826-829). The structure of the episode in the *Cyropaedia* resembles that of the *Cynegeticus* in its use of ethically based preface, a ‘technical’ section, and an epilogue. The technical section is not as descriptive or detailed as Xenophon’s advice on hunting, and is devoted more to listing the physical and moral qualities a good general should possess, rather than discussing details of military tactics.⁶⁹ The episode begins when Cyrus goes off at the head of an army to assist his uncle Cyaxares, king of the Medes, against a coalition of neighbouring forces led by the Assyrian king. After the ritual of prayer and sacrifice, which are rewarded with good omens from Zeus, Cyrus and his father set off for the Median border reassured by the open signs of divine support for the mission. Cambyses then tests Cyrus’ preparedness for the expedition and in the course of this testing process Xenophon gives the reader further insight into Cyrus’ education and Cambyses’ role in it. The passage has additional importance in that it also reflects the principles, both ethical and practical, that governed the lives of Xenophon and his readership.

Cambyses is not the only person to be a source of gnomic wisdom in the *Cyropaedia*. Cyrus himself at critical points uses *gnōmai* to ensure that the message he is trying to convey strikes home to his listeners. When Cyrus defeats his enemies and has just been installed in his palace in Babylon with a bodyguard of eunuchs and mercenaries, he realises that there is a danger that his Persian men, on whom he still relies, will relax and lose their discipline and self-restraint without further military duties

⁶⁸ Tatum 1989, 86.

⁶⁹ See Synopsis to chapter 6 of the Commentary for a discussion of this scene.

to occupy their time (7.5.70). He is therefore not content with preserving his newly-won *archē* but is already contemplating adding to it, for which he needs their services. He is anxious not to antagonise his most loyal servants, who have already been denied access to him by his retreat into the seclusion of his court, so he refrains from issuing orders to them in the manner of the typical Near Eastern despot. Cyrus speaks to them in person as a reassuring and, despite his comparative youthfulness, paternal figure in the mould of Cambyses. He makes them see that it is in their best interests to maintain their unity and discipline (7.5.75) and reminds them that winning is not everything; to win, and to hold on to what one has won, is a greater achievement which requires the continual maintenance of the virtues he has instilled into them,

Μέγα μὲν γὰρ οἶμαι ἔργον καὶ τὸ ἀρχὴν καταπράξαι, πολὺ δ' ἔτι μείζον τὸ λαβόντα διασώσασθαι. *Cyr.* 7.5.76

I think that while it is a great achievement to win an empire, it is an even greater one to preserve what one has taken.

Cyrus' deliberate use of maxims on occasions like these, in order to show others that it is not only in his interest to obey him, but in theirs too, is one of the keys to his success. He has learnt well from his father's advice on securing the willing obedience of men by appearing more willing to look after their interests than they are (1.6.21). Xenophon emphasises that Cyrus successfully applied this advice on a much larger scale by maintaining his large empire, without even being seen by many of his subjects (1.1.3) who nevertheless regarded him with a mixture of fear and admiration - fear of his military power and admiration for the apparent consideration he gave to all of them. Cyrus thus practised what he preached to his men in the example above with great success.

Cyaxares, king of the Medes, also uses time-honoured wisdom to argue his case at a critical point in the narrative (4.1.14 ff.). After the Medes' and Persians' first victory over the Assyrian forces, Cyrus realises that a golden opportunity to pursue the fleeing enemy is being missed because the Persians do not have cavalry to turn the flight into a rout (4.1.10). By thinking such thoughts aloud he invites the suggestion that Cyaxares, at this point still the nominal leader of the Persians and Medes, should be told of this in order to authorise a full-scale pursuit led by Median cavalry. Cyrus then agrees

to go and see his uncle, although he ensures that his Persian captains come along to support him, when he presents what he knows will be an unwelcome proposal to Cyaxares. Putting forward such a proposal in the presence of others is crucial to Cyrus' plans for gaining control of the campaign against the Assyrian king; not only does he need witnesses for dealing with any future recriminations for his actions from his uncle, but, as Xenophon also reveals, Cyrus needs to overcome his uncle's limited ambition and growing antipathy to the Persians. In keeping with this unfavourable portrayal of the Median king, Cyaxares is described as being jealous of the Persians' initiative.⁷⁰ It is also suggested that he has no stomach for another encounter with the enemy so soon after the last one, and moreover wants to stay where he is and drunkenly revel in the fruits of victory (4.1.13).

Xenophon cleverly sets the stage for the decisive encounter between these two men with such widely differing values and ambitions that will ultimately lead to Cyrus assuming control over the whole army. Having given us some insight into Cyaxares' state of mind, Xenophon then gives him the first speech in which he confirms his reluctance to undertake a pursuit of the Assyrians.⁷¹ Cyaxares begins by contrasting the different attitude of the Persians and other men to pleasure, *hēdonē*. The Persians are set apart from mankind with a kind of patronising disdain, “ὕμεις οἱ Πέρσαι”, as being the most careful not to take too much satisfaction in even the most trifling pleasure, as he himself has seen and heard (4.1.14). They are preoccupied only with abstinence, whereas Cyaxares the hedonistic Median knows all about pleasure in its varying degrees and how to deal with it, and he believes that he can now speak from a position of authority to his naive Persian allies. He implies that they are insatiable for more success on the battlefield when they should not be tempting fate by risking another encounter against the disorganised but still numerically superior enemy,

ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ τῆς μεγίστης ἡδονῆς πολὺ μάλιστα συμφέρειν ἐγκρατὴ εἶναι.
Μεῖζω δὲ ἡδονὴν τί παρέχει ἀνθρώποις εὐτυχίας ἢ νῦν ἡμῖν παραγεγένηται;

⁷⁰ See Appendix B on the character of Cyaxares.

⁷¹ See Tatum 1989, 124 f.; he notes that Cyaxares' speech “is a brilliantly conceived lesson in how not to think like Cyrus the Great”.

But it seems to me to be much more advantageous to practise restraint in the greatest of pleasures; and what pleasure could be greater for mankind than the success which has now come to us?

The idea of the hedonistic Median king praising the virtues of self-restraint, *enkrateia*, to Cyrus and the Persians, who have made the value a guiding force in their education and lives, is striking, but obviously intended to be ironic. Cyaxares is unabashed by his lack of moral fitness to utter such sentiments, and continues in the same vein, speaking of the benefits of enjoying success moderately, “σωφρόνως” (4.1.15). He argues that if they did the opposite and went for another victory, they would be taking risks in a manner similar to those who have enjoyed success at sea but eventually lose everything through wishing to repeat their success.

Cyaxares goes on to list a number of reasons for not pursuing the retreating enemy, drawing a further analogy between the retreating enemy and the cornered wild sow who will charge at her hunters in order to protect her young (4.1.17). Cyrus does not openly refute any of his arguments as he did on an earlier occasion (3.3.31); indeed, there is little in Cyaxares’ reasoning to which he could object. Xenophon gives the Median king a speech, which, in its selective use of gnomic wisdom and in the means of expression, is more typical of a Greek sage than an oriental king.⁷² The use of the analogy about the perils of the sea is reminiscent of Hesiod’s mistrust of seafaring and trading in the *Works and Days* (WD 236-237 & 618 ff.); similarly the mention of the wild beast at bay to illustrate a point recalls Homeric similes on the same theme. Cyaxares takes the Greek platitude, μηδὲν ἄγαν, and applies it to answering Cyrus’ proposal, and the latter, as a devotee of the moderation and self-restraint of which Cyaxares talks, cannot criticise his uncle for thinking and speaking this way. There is even a subtle hint by Xenophon of the lack of restraint shown historically by the Persians in their conquests. Cyaxares’ warnings of the dangers of the Persians becoming too eager to pursue military success are particularly apt in the light of the portrayal of

⁷² Tatum (*ibid.*) observes that “his mixture of what might be termed down-home thinking and military strategy is not a bad one”.

Persian kings in Herodotus as being insatiable for military victories and success in general.⁷³

The cautious sentiments underlying Cyaxares' speech may be generally sound but in the current situation they are hopelessly short-sighted. Xenophon chooses to highlight the differences between uncle and nephew by showing that even when Cyaxares can say something worthwhile, he chooses an inappropriate situation in which to say it. Cyrus knows the importance of following up military victories, and, as his father had advised him on the importance of deception in military tactics, he knows that one need not be constrained by conventional morality and fears when dealing with one's enemies. Moreover, the credibility of the Mede's arguments is undermined by the unsuitable character of the speaker. Cyaxares unwittingly condemns himself by concluding his speech with what may seem an afterthought, but, as Xenophon implies, it is the overriding reason for not wanting to pursue the enemy. Having proclaimed the virtue of enjoying lesser rather than greater pleasures, he says he would not like to rouse the Medes from their revelry in order to compel them to endanger themselves by chasing the Assyrians (4.1.18). Cyaxares thus shows his weakness and inability to control his men; he lacks the confidence to stop them celebrating their victory and to tell them to undergo the potentially hazardous pursuit. He thus forfeits any semblance of authority in the eyes of Cyrus and the Persians.

Cyrus, unlike Cyaxares, knows the right occasion for using gnomic wisdom and also the wrong occasion. A good illustration of his avoidance of using platitudes when they are unnecessary is provided by his conduct before the first military encounter with the Assyrians. Xenophon chooses to show the preparations for battle on both sides, in order to show the contrast in leadership and organisation between the Assyrians and Persians. On the one hand he portrays Cyrus fulfilling his religious duties and issuing orders to his captains in a calm, matter of fact way (3.3.34-42), on the other he depicts the Assyrian king making an impassioned plea to his men to stand firm and defend their

⁷³ E.g. Cyrus' insatiable greed for conquest (Hdt. 1.214 & 1.187); see also Avery 1972, 529-546 on this aspect of Herodotus' portrayal of Cyrus' later career.

land and possessions (3.3.43).⁷⁴ The Assyrian king's speech is a succession of earnest pleas aimed at convincing his men that it is in their interests to fight, and of warnings of the dire consequences of defeat. When the Assyrian king's exhortations are reported to the Persians by deserters, Cyrus is asked why he does not do the same to make his soldiers better. The confident young prince scoffs at the suggestion of his captain Chrysantas,

οὐδεμία γὰρ οὕτως ἐστὶ καλὴ παραίνεσις ἣτις τοὺς μὴ ὄντας ἀγαθοὺς
αὐθημερὸν ἀκούσαντας ἀγαθοὺς ποιήσει. *Cyr.* 3.3.50

For there is no exhortation, however fine it may be, which can on the same day make men good who are not already so.

Cyrus realises that the Assyrian king's words are those of a desperate man, trying to motivate men with whom he has had little previous contact and for whose soldiers' well-being and military training he has made no provision, unlike Cyrus. When Chrysantas presses him further on the matter, he explains that without a framework of laws, teachers and leaders to set an example to the men below them, anyone declaiming such fine sentiments on the spot, "τις ἀπορραψωδήσας παραχρήμα" is wasting his time (3.3.54). Training is the key to success in battle and Cyrus has trained his men to master their fear of the enemy (3.3.53), and he is sufficiently confident of their morale and their military prowess to believe that any rousing words of advice would be superfluous. To indulge in such speechifying before battles would be tantamount to admitting the possibility of defeat, something which Cyrus will not do.

In depicting Cyrus' rejection of the convention of the general's harangue, the *cohortatio* - what Xenophon refers to as the *parakeleusis* - a standard part of Greek literature from the time of Homer onwards, Xenophon emphasises the unconventional side of Cyrus' leadership.⁷⁵ His disregard for conventions of warfare and leadership sets

⁷⁴ See Aristotle *Rhet.* 1395A on the suitability of using *gnōmai* before a battle.

⁷⁵ See Keitel 1987, 153 ff. on the use of the *cohortatio* by Homer and Greek historians. Gera 1993, 109 ff. in her analysis of this scene considers Cyrus, in his objections to exhorting his troops at this point, to be "remarkably inconsistent" (*ibid.*, 110) in view of the numerous other occasions that he does exhort his troops (e.g. 4.2.21-26, 6.2.13-20, 7.5.19-24). However, she does proceed to demonstrate effectively

him apart from his opponents, whose limitations, exemplified by the brave but futile rhetoric of the Assyrian king, are ruthlessly exposed by the Persian prince. Cyrus' refusal to give a paraenetic speech to his troops is also in keeping with Xenophon's use of the *paraenesis* and wisdom literature in his works with regard to his readership. In his *Cynegeticus* he noted that the careful use of maxims can be an aid to education (*Cyn.* 13.3 ff.), and in a didactic work such as the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon includes maxims on practical and ethical matters throughout the work, on the basis that the educative effect of wisdom literature is cumulative rather than immediate. The hero of his *Cyropaedia* adopts the same policy towards the instruction of his men. Any attempt to improve untrained soldiers in a single hortatory speech just before a battle, as the Assyrian king tries to do, is doomed to failure as Cyrus realises (3.3.50 - see above). Moreover, if Cyrus were seen to be copying the emotional harangue of the Assyrian he would be dispelling the image of the steadfast paternal figure he has striven to create in the eyes of his men; he has decided to leave words of exhortation to his subordinates (3.3.39).

Cyrus does use the *cohortatio* when it is most needed, in the battle before Sardis which will decide the fate of the war with the Assyrians (7.1.10-17). The battle marks the culmination of all that Cyrus has strived for, as it offers him the opportunity to claim the greatest prize of all, the city of Babylon; above all, it marks the opportunity for his restructured and retrained army to prove their worth. With his future hanging in the balance Cyrus decides that his men's morale needs to be boosted by a few words from the commander-in-chief. These few words of encouragement are not so much paraenetic as timely reminders of each soldier of the role he has to play, they are *hypomnēseis* rather than *parakeleuseis*. The lengthy speech of the Assyrian king before the first battle smacked of desperation, whereas Cyrus' words are the words of a supremely confident leader, exulting in the prospect of battle. Xenophon's decision to include hortatory words to the troops from Cyrus indicates the magnitude and importance of the forthcoming struggle. The previous battles had been portrayed as

that the best response Cyrus can give to the rhetorical exhortation of the Assyrian king is silence, in order to prove how ineffective the latter's words have been on the Assyrian army (*ibid.*, 113 f.).

being comparatively low-key and predictable, but this battle promises to be the most crucial test of the Persians and their allies. The preparations before the battle begin according to the plan of previous military encounters of the Persians. Cyrus briefs his commanders on tactics and gives them instructions to follow (6.4.13-20); there then follows a description of sacrifice and of the armour worn by the Persians. To add to the formulaic nature of the scene there is a portent signalling divine approval for Cyrus in the battle.

When the opposing armies come in sight of each other Cyrus decides to choose the place which will best suit an attack (7.1.9) and sets off through the ranks of his army. After passing on the watchword to his soldiers, “Ζεὺς σωτὴρ καὶ ἡγεμῶν” reflecting his continuing espousal of Zeus in his role as god who guides kings and leaders, Cyrus calls out encouragement to his men. Cyrus calls out to his commoner troops small formulaic words of encouragement. He even indulges in a remark which is both light-hearted yet refers to the seriousness of the situation, likening the battle to a feast where everyone contributes an equal share,

ἽΩ ἄνδρες εἰς τίνα ποτ' ἂν καλλίονα ἔρανον ἀλλήλους παρακαλέσαιμεν ἢ εἰς τόνδε; νῦν γὰρ ἔξεστιν ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι γενομένοις πολλὰ κάγαθὰ ἀλλήλοις εἰσενεγκεῖν. *Cyr.* 7.1.12

Men, what better feast could we invite each other to than this one? For now is the time for men to be brave and bring in many good things for each other.

Cyrus' success in making all his men do their duty both on and off the battlefield stems from the fact that he not only acts as a fount of wisdom and advice, he is also seen to be practising what he preaches,

καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ φανερὸς ἦν ὥσπερ ἔλεγε καὶ πράττων. *Cyr.* 8.2.23

thus ensuring that he is seen as living by the universal truths which he instils into others. Even Croesus, the man made wise by his misfortunes, is taught a lesson on what should be done with wealth (8.2.15-23), and how a good name, *eukleia*, is a more valuable commodity than money. The example set by Cyrus in refusing to be seduced by riches is also maintained by his trusty friend from the commoner class, Pheraulas, who strikes up an unlikely friendship with a Sacian horseman in Cyrus' army (8.3.35-50 - see above Introduction D (ii) for a Homeric parallel for their encounter). The two men come to

an arrangement whereby Pheraulas divests himself of all the considerable wealth he has recently acquired, and continues to acquire, to the willing care of the Sacian, in order that he might regain the peace of mind he enjoyed when he was poor. Xenophon portrays Pheraulas as a slightly comical figure, who has a touching faith in the goodness of mankind and an instinctive dislike of luxury and wealth with its attendant cares. However, Pheraulas, despite his apparent naiveté, also has a fund of homespun wisdom which he is ready to impart to those who will listen. His depiction of his upbringing by his father, who worked hard and lived frugally to support his son, and whose practical and ethical values were transferred to Pheraulas as he made an honest living tending a small patch of land, is a vindication of the worth of rustic simplicity and frugal living. Pheraulas occupies the same moral high ground as the renowned smallholder from Ascrea, Hesiod, in his readiness to point to the beneficial educative effects of agricultural life and hard work. Such a character appeals to Cyrus, who is delighted to have in his army a living embodiment of the values he is trying to instill into his men, and he honours Pheraulas by entrusting him with marshalling his victory parade through Babylon (8.3.2).

It is easy to overstate the case for the influence of wisdom literature on the *Cyropaedia*, and discount the originality of thought of Xenophon in coining aphorisms. Yet in such a didactic work, it would be difficult to believe that Xenophon was prepared to ignore the value attached by his contemporaries to works containing gnomic wisdom and collections of maxims (such as his character Gobryas claims to possess), and not make any kind of reference to them. His use of gnomic wisdom is designed to show his own moral fitness for the task he has appointed for himself - to depict semi-historical scenes from the life of a man he considers worthy of admiration (1.1.6), not least for what he claims were Cyrus' attempts to impose morality and order throughout a vast empire. Through the examples listed above one can see that Xenophon's skill lies in his selection and illustration of gnomic wisdom - most notably in the paraenetic conversation between father and son in chapter 6 of Book 1 - and in the cumulative effect of blending practical and ethical instances of such wisdom into the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* so that the 'Education of Cyrus' also becomes the education of the

audience. To the modern reader, unused to such an openly didactic approach in writing literature, Xenophon's touch may seem heavy-handed and pompous, but such an approach was perfectly acceptable in Xenophon's day, at a time when, according to the author, the standards of the Persians had slipped from the lofty plateau occupied by Cyrus and his followers,

Αἱ μὲν δὴ γινώμει ταύτῃ τῷ παντὶ χείρους νῦν ἢ τὸ παλαιὸν αὐτῶν. *Cyr.* 8.8.7
[They have] principles now which are in all respects worse than the ones they had in olden times.

(iv) Drama

Xenophon refers to drama and choral performances a number of times in his works; he mentions theatrical performances, such as the one taking place in Sparta in 371 B.C. when a messenger brought news of the crushing defeat at Leuctra (*HG* 6.4.16) and in the *Hipparchicus* he mentions choral dances at the Great Dionysia festival of Athens (*Eq. Mag.* 3.2); moreover, he also uses drama as a source of analogies for warfare. This discussion does not assume that Xenophon was greatly influenced by Greek drama when writing the *Cyropaedia*, it merely acknowledges the possibility of drama being part of the background of the work.

Xenophon closes his account of the first battle between Cyrus' forces and the Assyrians with contrasting scenes of both sides, on the one hand the defeated Assyrian forces fleeing panic-stricken towards their camp, on the other Cyrus' Persians beating an orderly retreat out of range of enemy missiles. Then, Xenophon notes, one could see the perfect training of the peers, for as they drew up in line, they each knew their places "more accurately than a chorus",

ἔστησαν κατὰ χώραν πολὺ μᾶλλον χοροῦ ἀκριβῶς εἰδότες ὅπου ἔδει ἕκαστον γενέσθαι. *Cyr.* 3.3.70

The theatre of war is thus linked to the theatre of dramatic festivals and choral dance. Xenophon cleverly describes the orderly arrangement and prescribed movements of the Persian army by using a visual metaphor with which his readers would have been

familiar, the choreographed movements of dancers in a theatre. Even the display of an army of Anatolian barbarians, the Mossynoecians, in a land totally removed from Greek culture, can conjure up in Xenophon's mind images of choral dancers (*An.* 5.4.12). Cyrus' peers resemble the members of a chorus because they too have undergone a rigorous and precise training and they too are competing for a prize - the prize of victory in battle where the stakes are higher. The peers are accordingly even more disciplined and precise than a chorus, as his father Cambyses had predicted they would be if Cyrus trained his men by means of announcing martially-orientated contests with prizes,

τοῦτο γὰρ ποιήσας, σάφ' ἴσθι, ὥσπερ χοροὺς τὰς τάξεις ἀεὶ τὰ προσήκοντα μελετώσας θεάσῃ. *Cyr.* 1.6.18

For if you do this, you may rest assured that you will always see your companies practising their duties like a chorus.

The idea of the general acting as a kind of chorus leader, *χορηγός*, appears elsewhere in Xenophon's works, most notably in a passage in the *Memorabilia*, where Socrates discusses with a certain Nicomachides the qualities necessary for a good general. When Nicomachides complains that Antisthenes, who has never distinguished himself in military matters, has been elected a general, Socrates sets out to show that military experience is not as important as having proved that one has the right mental qualities for leadership in other spheres of life. Socrates points out that Antisthenes is eager for victory, a good quality for a general, which is proved by the fact that whenever he has been a *chorēgos* his chorus has always won (*Mem.* 3.4.3). Nicomachides argues that one cannot draw analogies between organising a chorus and an army, but Socrates refutes his argument by pointing out that success in both activities is dependent simply on picking the best men for the job, knowing what one wants and getting it (*Mem.* 3.4.4-6) - attributes which Cyrus as a general displays throughout the *Cyropaedia*. The same analogy is also drawn in the *Hiero*, when the Sicilian tyrant mentions that one of the few pleasurable duties in his onerous lifestyle is supervising choral competitions. He goes on to talk of introducing the ideas of delegation of responsibility and awarding prizes for excellence, which are present in such competitions, into not just military spheres of activity, but also into commercial ones as well (*Hier.* 9.3-10).

Failure to introduce these ideas and to instil order in the combination of men who

make up a chorus and an army, results in chaos in both of them, as Ischomachus points out to his wife in the *Oeconomicus* (*Oec.* 8.3-4). The same idea is expressed in a different way in the *Memorabilia*. Socrates, in conversation with the son of Pericles, tries to dispel the latter's despondency about the degeneracy of the Athenians by reminding him that amongst other things the Athenians are still sufficiently disciplined to obey their choral teachers willingly (*Mem.* 3.5.18). Success in both the theatres of human endeavour is also neatly linked by Xenophon in the *Agesilaus*, when he describes the Spartan king returning home from military success against the Argives just in time to celebrate the Hyacinthia festival and joining in the singing of the paean to Apollo; even the victorious king submits to the will of the chorus leader concerning where he should stand, “ὅπου ἐτάχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ χοροποιού” (*Ages.* 2.17).

From the examples mentioned above, it can be seen that drama provided Xenophon with good visual metaphors in his works. Tragedy certainly provides precedents with one of the darkest and visually strongest scenes in the *Cyropaedia* when Cyrus and Panthea mourn over the mutilated corpse of Abradatas (7.3.8-13). The story of the doomed love of Panthea and Abradatas has already been mentioned as displaying traits belonging to Homeric epic; it also contains the pathos and the open portrayal of death in all its gory nature which characterises tragedy in the episode encompassing Cyrus' discovery of Abradatas' death and the suicide of Panthea over her husband's body.⁷⁶ The obvious tragic models are the *Hippolytus* and *Bacchae* of Euripides which have famous scenes based on lamentation over a mutilated body. The piecing together of the corpse of Abradatas deliberately seems to evoke the fate of Pentheus in the *Bacchae*. A lacuna in the text of the *Bacchae* has led to speculation as to whether Agave actually assembled the severed limbs of her son on stage, but there is no reason

⁷⁶ Cf. Tatum 1989, 183 ff.; he comments that, “his [Xenophon's] representation of the last moments of Panthea is awkward and conventional in its character and design. Familiarity with Homer and Athenian tragedy seems to have been helpful ... she dies like a heroine on the tragic stage”.

to doubt that this act was part of the staging.⁷⁷ Seneca also has a similarly gruesome scene in his *Phaedra*, when Theseus reassembles his son's corpse for burial (*Phaedr.* 1261 ff.).

In the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus' role in this episode is reminiscent of Agave in the *Bacchae*. Like Agave he is confronted with the death of someone close to him in three stages in which the tragic consequences of the death graphically and gradually unfold before his eyes. First he is told of Abradatas' demise, and he rushes off to the scene "ἤλαυνεν ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος" (7.3.6). Then he tearfully addresses the corpse in a disbelieving manner as if he cannot accept the dreadful news he has just heard. Any such illusions are dispelled by his discovery of the gory and harsh reality of death on the battlefield, as Abradatas' hand comes off when he proffers a grasp of friendship to his recent friend and ally. Panthea lovingly rearranges the corpse then bitterly laments the joint responsibility she and Cyrus share in sending her husband to his death. The subsequent suicide of Panthea, and then of her eunuchs, provides a grim yet appropriate ending to the whole episode. Such a powerful and horrific scene was calculated to leave a lasting impression, its intense pathos and violent imagery distinguishing it from any other part of the narrative of the *Cyropaedia*. In this episode tragedy seems to have been an obvious source of inspiration for Xenophon.

(v) Herodotus

λέγουσι Πέρσαι ὡς Δαρεῖος μὲν ἦν κάπηλος, Καμβύσης δὲ δεσπότης, Κύρος δὲ πατὴρ, ὃ μὲν ὅτι ἐκαπήλευε πάντα τὰ πρήγματα, ὃ δὲ ὅτι χαλεπός τε ἦν καὶ ὀλίγωρος, ὃ δὲ ὅτι ἡπιός τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ σφι πάντα ἐμηχανήσατο. Hdt. 3.89
The Persians say that Darius was a huckster, Cambyses a despot, and Cyrus a father, the first because he haggled over everything, the next because he was both cruel and contemptuous, and the last because he was kind and in all matters contrived good for them.

Herodotus thus provides us with what he claims to be the Persians' own succinct

⁷⁷ See Jeanne Roux's commentary on the *Bacchae* for a discussion of the staging of this scene (Roux, J. 1970, II, 613 ff.).

opinion of their first three emperors, in much the same way that Aeschylus lists the respective qualities of the kings of Asia in the *Persae* (see above Introduction C). According to Bodil Due, "Xenophon had a thorough knowledge of his predecessors and contemporaries. He certainly knew Herodotus, Thucydides (whose work he continues but whom he does not mention by name), Plato and Isocrates".⁷⁸ Xenophon's knowledge of Herodotus is certainly not in doubt; in the *Cyropaedia* there are numerous points of reference to Herodotus' work (as will be demonstrated in the Commentary). Herodotus had provided a full account of the life of Cyrus in Book 1 of his work, and his work would have been known to Xenophon's audience, so Xenophon could not have ignored his version of Cyrus' life. Vivienne Gray has demonstrated that in terms of style and approach to writing historical narrative Xenophon's *Hellenica* owes more to Herodotus than Thucydides, whose work he is supposed to have continued in the *Hellenica*.⁷⁹ The same holds true for the *Cyropaedia* where Xenophon is distinctly Herodotean in approach, and the influence of Thucydides is not so readily detected.⁸⁰ Gray cites in support of her theory an important ancient commentator, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who compared Xenophon with Herodotus in his *On Imitation* and in his letter to Gnaeus Pompeius Geminus.⁸¹ Dionysius judged Xenophon to be more like Herodotus in his style and subject matter (D. H. *Pomp.*4). Xenophon's choice of subject matter and historical themes reflected his own good moral character (*ibid.*), and in the

⁷⁸ Due 1989, 241. Due provides a detailed and lengthy analysis of the relationship between Herodotus' and Xenophon's accounts of Cyrus (*ibid.* 117-135).

⁷⁹ Gray 1989, 1 ff.

⁸⁰ References to possible parallels in Thucydides' works can be found in the Commentary on Book 1, though these are overshadowed by the number of references to Herodotus' work. Gray makes the important and often overlooked point that Xenophon in his historical writings - the *Cyropaedia* being included in this category - "leans more to Herodotus than he does to Thucydides", even though he is usually regarded as the continuator of Thucydides' work in the *Hellenica* (*ibid.*, 4). If Thucydides' work had included the final years of the Peloponnesian War, when the Persians were actively involved in supporting the Spartan cause, there might have been a greater Thucydidean influence on the *Cyropaedia*.

⁸¹ Gray 1989, 2 ff.

organisation of his narrative, by his use of digressions and linguistic style he strove to imitate Herodotus. Indeed, the evidence from what remains of other fourth century historical writers - Theopompus, Ctesias and, at a later date, Duris - points to Herodotus, as the inheritor of an earlier tradition pioneered by the logographers, having far greater influence than Thucydides.⁸²

Detailed comparisons have already been made between the *Cyropaedia* and Herodotus' work.⁸³ This section will concentrate in brief on the more subtle, 'indirect' areas of Herodotean influence on Xenophon to demonstrate how Xenophon produces an account of Near Eastern history that is very different from Herodotus' account of the same events, but which also adopts and preserves narrative themes of his predecessor's work. It will suffice to provide two examples which clearly illustrate how Xenophon assimilates elements of Herodotus' narrative into the *Cyropaedia*: Herodotus' account of the first great ruler of the Medes, Deioces (Hdt. 1.96 ff.) and his account of how Cyrus persuades his Persians to rebel against the Medes (Hdt. 1.125 ff.).

Herodotus' story of the rise to power of Deioces the Mede serves as an introduction and a comparison to his account of the life of Cyrus. He shows how a common man based his bid for power on satisfying the Medes' expectations on how a king should behave. He acquires a reputation for being fair and just, ἰθὺς and δίκαιος,

⁸² See Gray 1989, 5, "Thucydides had far less influence on historians contemporary with Xenophon than Herodotus did". Gera 1993, 3 ff. examines possible predecessors of Xenophon in the writing of biographies (Xanthus of Lydia, Scylax of Caryanda etc.), whose works no longer exist but who clearly belong to the logographic tradition continued by fourth century historians, notably Ctesias of Cnidus. Due includes a section on the influence of Ctesias' *Persika* on the *Cyropaedia* (Due 1989, 135 ff.; Gera also examines Ctesias' influence on Xenophon (Gera 1993, 210 f.). The date of the *Persika* is unknown; however, Xenophon was aware of the existence of Ctesias' work, as he refers to it in the *Anabasis* when describing the death of Cyrus the Younger at Cunaxa (*An.* 1.8.26). Unfortunately, Ctesias' text has only survived through fragments of the universal history of Nicolaus of Damascus and Photius' epitome, so close comparison of the *Persika* and Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* is not possible. Xenophon does seem to refer to the *Persika* in his account of Cyrus' quarrel with the Sacian cupbearer (see Commentary on chapter 3 of Book 1).

⁸³ E.g. Due (see note 35) and Hirsch 1985, 77 ff.

which persuades his fellow countrymen to install him as their monarch, whereupon, for his own protection, he sets precedents for appropriate royal behaviour. This code of etiquette is reliant on the isolation of the king from his subjects and the adoption of a formal and austere lifestyle, continually dispensing justice for the people. It is Deioces' standards of kingship which are followed by the Cyrus of the *Cyropaedia*. When he installs himself as a ruler in Babylon Cyrus recognises the importance of controlling his subjects' access to him, even his oldest friends among the Persian nobility, and takes steps to ensure that his appearances to them should be as infrequent as possible to ensure that he continues to command their respect and to add to the effect of 'bewitching' his subjects by appearing as a magnificent, remote leader (7.5.37 ff.). Deioces takes the principle of seclusion to extremes, communicating through messengers, refusing admission to his presence in case potential rivals grow jealous of his position, and governing as a disembodied voice of justice. Xenophon depicts the organisation of Cyrus' court as following the same lines.⁸⁴

A brief analysis of Herodotus' account of how Cyrus organises his army to rebel against the Medes, also demonstrates how, in superficially a very different account, Xenophon has expressed the essence of Herodotus' narrative in his account of Cyrus' reorganisation of his own army and his usurpation of Median control over the joint forces fighting the Assyrians. Herodotus' Cyrus has two objectives: he has to prove to the Persians that he is the man to lead them out of bondage to the Medes, and he has to instil in them the desire to fight. In the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus also has these objectives in mind when he addresses the Persian peers for the first time (1.5.7 ff.), although they are hinted at under the pretext of his exhorting his men for the forthcoming struggle against the Assyrians.⁸⁵ The first objective of Herodotus' Cyrus is easily accomplished with an act of cunning to which the Persians prove to be gullible; having summoned an assembly of Persians, he produces in front of them a self-penned message which he pretends has come from Astyages, and which supposedly declares that Cyrus is to be the *stratēgos*

⁸⁴ See Carlier 1978, 148 ff. for a convincing analysis of the despotic nature of Cyrus' imperial monarchy.

⁸⁵ See Synopsis and Commentary on chapter 5 of Book 1.

of the Persians (Hdt. 1.125). Xenophon's Cyrus is taught the need for deceit in warfare by his father in chapter 6 of Book 1, and subsequently deceives his uncle and ally, Cyaxares the Median king, by indirectly gaining the latter's permission to recruit the majority of the Median army to his side after the first battle against the Assyrians (4.1.10 ff.).⁸⁶

The second objective of Herodotus' Cyrus requires a more ingenious act of persuasion. Cyrus commands the Persians to reassemble and each man to bring a sickle, δρέπανον, with him. The sickle is both a symbol of the Persians' simple rural lifestyle and of their subservience to the Medes. The agricultural implement could be converted to serve as a weapon in war,⁸⁷ and Cyrus seeks to make a conversion of the Persians from farmers into soldiers. Xenophon's Cyrus in effect seeks to do the same thing for his commoner troops in the army, who are from an agricultural background and are not properly trained for warfare.⁸⁸ He thus proposes to re-arm them for the campaign against the Assyrians by exchanging their light arms for the heavy armour worn by their superiors (2.1.14 ff.).

In Herodotus' account Cyrus orders the Persians to clear a piece of land covered in thorns. When they complete the task in the day allotted to them, the next day they are invited to feast on the livestock of Cyrus' father. After the feast Cyrus takes the opportunity to offer them the simple choice of becoming soldiers and enjoying an abundance of the good things they have just sampled or of remaining farmers and spending the rest of their days in the drudgery of the previous day. If they are still undecided Cyrus adds that he believes that he has divine help, "θεῖν ῥύχῃ", in his mission to liberate the Persians; moreover, he believes that they are in no way inferior to the Medes in war or in anything else (Hdt. 1.126). In the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon's Cyrus

⁸⁶ See Synopsis to chapter 4 of the Commentary for a discussion of this scene.

⁸⁷ In the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus has scythes attached to his chariots (6.1.30), and in the *Anabasis* Xenophon describes how both armies at the battle of Cunaxa used scythe-bearing chariots, τὰ ἄρματα δρεπανηφόρα (*An.* 1.7.10 & 1.8.10).

⁸⁸ E.g. the archetypal commoner Pheraulas, who later wins Cyrus' favour, and describes his own poor rustic upbringing to contrast it with his current riches and high status (8.3.37).

also recognises the importance of motivating his men by offering them rewards. He therefore offers the commoner troops in his army the opportunity to compete with their officers to receive rewards and booty purely on the basis of merit (2.3.1 ff.); such an act is in accordance with his previously stated belief that they are not inferior to their superiors in the army (2.1.14). Finally, the idea that Cyrus receives divine support for his actions is central to the narrative of the *Cyropaedia*, and he himself gratefully acknowledges the help of the gods throughout his career as he lies on his deathbed (8.7.3).

E. *The Date of the Work*

The dating of the *Cyropaedia* and of Xenophon's works in general is a controversial issue, which can never be resolved satisfactorily in view of the lack of evidence to support the various arguments made for each possible date. Attempts to form a definite chronological table of Xenophon's works and to trace their influence on each other and their relevance to specific historical events rest entirely on speculation and the scholar's personal interpretation of Xenophon's work.⁸⁹ Furthermore, Xenophon repeats many of his ideas and themes in different works and it is not possible to ascertain in which of them the idea first appeared.⁹⁰ This thesis has accordingly been

⁸⁹ Delebecque's *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon* is the prime example of this approach. Delebecque attempts to trace Xenophon's life through his works, relating their content to specific historical events of the first half of the fourth century B.C. and regarding the work as being addressed to an Athenian audience. Thus the *Cyropaedia*, in his opinion, was written c. 360 in view of the important military role of the Egyptians in Book 7 of the *Cyropaedia* that reflects current Athenian interest in Egypt where Agesilaus had his final campaign (Delebecque 1957, 400 ff.). Such an approach, though ingenious in many respects, leads to conclusions which cannot be substantiated in view of the paucity of evidence in their favour.

⁹⁰ Gera 1993, 24 f. Despite the dangers involved in dating the *Cyropaedia* from Xenophon's other texts, I agree with her belief that the "*Cyropaedia* is a kind of summary of Xenophon's literary activity and consequently is a late work".

written without adhering to a definite date for the composition of the work, but I have operated on the assumption that *Cyropaedia* dates from a period closer to the end of Xenophon's career than the beginning.

The only real clue to providing a date of the work is to be found in the final chapter of the work (8.8.1 ff.),⁹¹ which deals with the disintegration of Cyrus' empire and the moral decline of the Persians.⁹² In his catalogue of the vices of the Persians of his day, Xenophon mentions the conduct of Rheomithres and Mithridates towards their relatives, as being indicative of Persian degeneracy (8.8.4). Both these men were involved in the Satraps' revolt against the Persian king in 362/1, which points to the *Cyropaedia* being written c.361. This date is supported by the apparent prominence of the work in 350s when it was attacked by Plato in his *Laws*.⁹³

⁹¹ Gera, citing Anderson 1970, 165-191, 211 & 217 f., believes that the battle between Croesus and Cyrus at Thymbrara (7.1.1 ff.) was written in the light of the battle of Leuctra between Sparta and Thebes in 371.

⁹² Recent scholarship on the *Cyropaedia* has convincingly demonstrated that the final chapter is authentic, and that it is an integral part of the work as a whole rather than a late addition to the text (Tatum 1989 215 ff., Due 1989, 16 ff. & Gera 1993, 299 f.).

⁹³ See Appendix C for a discussion of the relationship between the *Laws* and the *Cyropaedia*. Plato possibly alludes to the *Cyropaedia* in his *Politicus* when he says with regard to kings that they cannot be compared to the 'king bee' in his hive, who is obviously outstanding in body and mind from the other bees (*Plt.* 301D ff.). Skemp notes that Artabazus in the *Cyropaedia* does compare Cyrus to a 'king bee' because the Persian prince is so superior to everyone else (5.1.24), so Plato may be taking issue with Xenophon here (Skemp 1961, 212 n.). Skemp elsewhere dates the *Politicus* to between the years 366-361 (*ibid.*, 17), which might suggest an earlier date than 361 for the appearance of the *Cyropaedia*. However, it is just as likely that Xenophon was taking issue with Plato's comment in the *Politicus* by applying the bee metaphor to Cyrus, in the same way that it is possible that the *Cyropaedia* could have been intended to answer Isocrates' slighting comparison of Cyrus with Evagoras (*Ev.* 37-38).

Commentary on Book 1

Chapter 1

Synopsis

Xenophon introduces the central theme of his work, an examination on the problems of leadership and transitory nature of the various systems of power devised by mankind, and in particular by the Greek *poleis* - a subject which fourth century contributors to the *politeia* debate had to address, in the midst of increasing confusion and instability of the Greek political world in the first half of the century. The apparently indirect and understated approach of his opening words should not disguise the seriousness of Xenophon's intentions. He indicates at the earliest possible opportunity that the *Cyropaedia* is a product of his personal meditations on government and constitutions, and as such should be treated as his contribution to the ongoing debate in Greek literature on the subject of the best system of government and not as a biographical novel on Cyrus the Great. Xenophon's understanding and presentation of politics has been regarded as lacking in profundity,¹ however, this view was not shared in antiquity. Aulus Gellius certainly places the work in the ranks of fourth century political philosophy, claiming in the *Noctes Atticae* that the *Cyropaedia* was written in response to the publication of the first two books of Plato's *Republic* (Gell. 14.3.3). Xenophon, according to Aulus Gellius, was signalling his differences with Plato's thought by advocating monarchy as the best system of government. Whether true or apocryphal, Gellius' anecdote gives an indication of how later antiquity did not treat the *Cyropaedia* purely as a didactic work or a forerunner to the romances of antiquity, but could regard it as a work which had sufficient insight on political philosophy and leadership to rival the *Republic*.² In these opening chapters Xenophon is writing as someone who has been detached through exile from direct involvement in government,

¹ See Anderson 1974, 45.

² See Münscher 1920, 36 ff. & Breitenbach 1966, 1707 f.

though he remains a committed observer of the vicissitudes in fourth century Greek *poleis* (cf. his gloomy and abrupt conclusion to the *Hellenica* after describing the aftermath of the battle of Mantinea, which conveys his own sense of frustration with the political situation in Greece (HG 7.5.26-27).³

He begins the work by listing the four basic types of constitutions known to the Greek world, democracy, monarchy, oligarchy and tyranny, and by recalling how often these kinds of government have failed to win the support of the people, especially tyrannies (1.1.1). He then proceeds to draw an analogy between the difficulties of political government and the apparent problems faced by some men in the control of slaves in a household, *oikos*. He extends the scope of his argument to compare the harmonious relationship between the herdsman and his animals with the discord that occurs between a ruler and his subjects (1.1.2). The author is left with the bleak, but apparently inescapable, conclusion that mankind is the most difficult of all creatures to govern (1.1.3). However, such a conclusion is rendered invalid by the example of Cyrus, the Persian king, whose reign was remarkable for the size of his dominions and the fact that his subjects obeyed him willingly, no matter how remote they were from him. Cyrus' success distinguishes him from other kings, in particular kings of barbarian peoples, who have proved to be incapable of extending their rule, whereas he was able, from small beginnings, to subdue and to incorporate a number of previously independent peoples into his empire (1.1.4). The spectacular growth of his power and the obedience of these peoples is attributed to his ability to inspire and to reconcile two otherwise conflicting emotions in his subjects: a strong fear of his authority, coupled with a deep-seated trust in him, which leads them to surrender their autonomy and to endeavour to please him (1.1.5). The result is an empire whose magnitude is difficult for Greeks to comprehend. Xenophon considers that the example of Cyrus is worth studying, in particular his *genea*, *physis* and *paideia*, in order to uncover the art of governing over other men (1.1.6).

In the space of this chapter Xenophon has summarised a number of popular ideas

³ See Dillery 1995, 19-20.

relating to the art, the *epistēmē* or *technē*, of ruling over other men. The same ideas are discussed in theoretical terms in his other works, in particular the *Memorabilia* (e.g. *Mem.* 2.1.1 ff., 3.1.1 ff. & 3.9.10 ff.), the *Oeconomicus* (e.g. *Oec.* 4.5 ff., 14.1 ff. & 21.2 ff.) and the *Hiero* (e.g. 9.1 ff.). Xenophon depicts Socrates making the assertion in the *Memorabilia* that kings and rulers are those who simply know how to rule,

βασιλεῖς δὲ καὶ ἄρχοντας οὐ τοὺς τὰ σκῆπτρα ἔχοντας ἔφη εἶναι οὐδὲ τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων αἰρεθέντας οὐδὲ τοὺς κλήρῳ λαχόντας οὐδὲ τοὺς βιασαμένους οὐδὲ ἐξαπατήσαντας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐπισταμένους ἄρχειν. *Mem.* 3.9.10

He said that kings and rulers are not those men who hold sceptres of kingship, nor are they those who are chosen by ordinary men, or those who obtain their position by lot, or those who use force or who deceive; they are those who know how to rule.

Socrates is referring to people with an *epistēmē* of leadership, an inner knowledge that transcends in importance any of the external trappings and symbols of power, or any method of mankind to bypass it and attain power by the various means mentioned above. It is this knowledge of leadership which Socrates illustrates to his followers in the *Memorabilia*. In Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* Ischomachus demonstrates his mastery of it through the successful management of his rural *oikos*, and in the *Hiero* the poet Simonides uses it to advise the Sicilian tyrant Hiero. Xenophon adopts a different approach to expounding the *epistēmē* of leadership in the *Cyropaedia*; an approach which is more practical than theoretical. He provides an extended account of the career of Cyrus, a king who possessed this knowledge of leadership and whose achievements are magnified by their immense scale and success, and by the impressive longevity of the institutions which he created.

When Xenophon defines the art of being a king or ruler in simple terms of knowing how to rule, he does so in order to show how this knowledge can be applied to all manner of situations in life where leadership of some kind is required. The basic principles and techniques which he describes Cyrus as using in controlling his empire can be applied on a much smaller scale to controlling a *polis* and to running an *oikos*. The linking of such analogous situations in the opening chapter of the *Cyropaedia*, and the connection Xenophon makes between the role of the herdsman and that of the ruler are not evidence of radical new thinking, merely a restatement of previous and current ideas on the subject. The connection between successful management of one's *oikos* and

playing a successful role in the government of one's *polis* seems to have been popular amongst Socrates' disciples (e.g. *Mem.* 3.4.12, *Pl. Men.* 73A ff. & 91A, *Pl. Plt.* 258E & *Pl. Prt.* 318E).⁴ The idea of kings, rulers and generals acting as 'shepherds of the people' was a popular Greek conception;⁵ it appears as early as the *Iliad*, where Agamemnon is given the epithet 'ποιμήν λαῶν'. The related literary motif of the abandoned royal infant being rescued and brought up by a herdsman and eventually claiming his birthright, appears in Herodotus' account of Cyrus' life, and also in Ctesias' account where his mother is a goatherd. It also appears in the Near Eastern myth of the great ruler, Sargon of Akkad.⁶

The military connotations surrounding the idea of the ruler being a 'shepherd of the people' are of particular relevance to the *Cyropaedia* and Book 1 in particular.⁷ Xenophon's main contribution to the *politeia* debate of the fourth century was to make explicit the connection between civic and military leadership, in the belief that the former could be improved by adopting the principles and skills necessary for the successful pursuit of the latter.⁸ Such a belief in the civic application of military science appears to go well beyond what was envisaged by Plato in the *Republic*,⁹ despite his evident admiration for the military-based constitution of Sparta. Although there are military elements in the arrangement of the constitution of Plato's ideal state in the *Republic*, and Xenophon's Persians resemble the austere inhabitants of Plato's state, Xenophon's portrayal of the pastoral absolute ruler in the *Cyropaedia* appears to be categorically rejected by Plato in the *Politicus* (*Plt.* 274D ff.).¹⁰ The analogous leadership roles of the

⁴ On the connection in Plato's *Politicus*, see Skemp 1961, 123 n.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 57 ff.

⁶ See Drews 1974, 387-393.

⁷ See Skemp 1961, 58 f.

⁸ See Wood 1964, 33-66.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 41-51.

¹⁰ See Skemp 1961, 59 ff.

shepherd and the general and king are briefly discussed by Socrates in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 3.2.1 ff.), and by Niceratus and Antisthenes in the *Symposium* (*Symp.* 4.6), but are only fully examined in the *Cyropaedia*. Xenophon clearly has this analogy in mind in the opening lines of chapter 1, but deliberately avoids any direct reference to warfare or the skills of generalship in his summary at this point. He prefers to delay the impact of his own thinking on the subject until later in the narrative, when he introduces his model of military leadership and organization which could be applied to civic society in the discussion between Cambyses and Cyrus (1.6.2 ff.), and then proceeds to illustrate it in the narrative of Books 2-8.

Cyrus is chosen by Xenophon to be the ultimate 'shepherd of the people' (8.2.14). He is portrayed as an individual who stands out from the herd of humanity, and who exercises despotic rule with a calculated benevolence in order to gain the love of his subjects, who in turn regard him as a father figure (8.1.1 & 8.2.9). Xenophon's Cyrus is also first and foremost a military leader, who is able successfully to convert his methods of maintaining absolute control over his army into a system of government for a vast empire. The example of his career is not used as an exception which proves the rule of the difficulty of leading mankind, but as the exception whose career shows that there are opportunities and certain methods that can be used in attaining the apparently impossible goal of controlling other men. Cyrus thus becomes the personification of the *epistēmē* of leadership, and the Persian state of the *Cyropaedia* accordingly becomes inseparable from the figure of Cyrus the ruler, who acts as a 'seeing law', "βλέποντα νόμον", a living illustration of correct conduct for his subjects (8.1.22).¹¹

Xenophon emphasises the exceptional nature of his rule and the importance of Cyrus as a person by listing the various peoples that the Persian king conquered (1.1.4). There is an implicit contrast made by the author between the Greek world which shared a common language and culture, but was beset with problems and disunity (cf. 1.1.1), and the immensity and stability of Cyrus' polyglot empire. Xenophon also compares the success of Cyrus with that of other barbarian kings of the fourth century, who find it

¹¹ See Höistad 1948, 80 f.

difficult enough to rule their own people and who would never contemplate the scale of conquest he managed. Xenophon includes the conquests of Cyrus and also his successors, Cambyses, Darius and Xerxes in chapter 1 of the *Cyropaedia*. Cyrus' empire is thus the Persian empire at its greatest extent in the fifth century, not the one created by the historical Cyrus in the sixth century. He deliberately magnifies the nature and extent of Cyrus' historical achievements in order to stress the greatness of his subject, and in doing so he follows a precedent set by Herodotus and Thucydides in the *proemium* of their respective works of *auxēsis*: amplifying the theme of the work in order to stress its importance and worthiness (cf. Hdt. 5.49 where Aristagoras endeavours to persuade the Spartan king Cleomenes to support the Ionian revolt from the Persians by showing him a map of Asia; Aristagoras lists all the peoples of the empire to emphasise the vastness of the Persian king's land and to show the attractiveness of fighting and defeating the Persians).¹²

The list of peoples conquered by Cyrus has some surprising inclusions and omissions, which are indicative of its lack of verisimilitude and also of an apparent carelessness on the part of the author. He takes his first liberty with an historical fact, by claiming that the nations of Asia enjoyed an autonomy similar to those of Europe before Cyrus conquered them, even though he would have been aware that the peoples of the Near East had been ruled for centuries by the empires of the Assyrians, Medes, Egyptians, Babylonians and Hittites. His conception of Asia before Cyrus comprising autonomous nations is later contradicted when he describes the Assyrian king as being in control of various peoples of Asia (1.5.2), and when the Armenians are described as vassals of the Medes (2.4.12). The most glaring departure from historical fact is his statement that Cyrus became the leader of the Medes with their consent. The idea that Cyrus' annexation of Media was entirely peaceful is at variance with Near Eastern sources and with Herodotus' and Ctesias' accounts of Persian history; moreover, Xenophon himself had seen evidence of the destruction caused by the Persian revolt from the Median overlordship (*An.* 3.4.7-8). In this instance Xenophon is not being

¹² See Gomme 1945, 89 f. on the reasons for *auxēsis* in Thucydides' work;

careless, he is deliberately distorting historical fact to incorporate a central theme of the *Cyropaedia*: the idea that Cyrus' conquest of the Media is carried out by guile rather than force, and with the support of the majority of the Medes.

One of the subject peoples included in the list, the Arabians, were not conquered by the Persians according to Herodotus. He observes that they, out of all the peoples of Asia, were the only people not regarded as slaves of the Persian king (Hdt. 3.88). They were treated as a friendly nation after allowing Cambyses' army safe passage into Egypt, but did pay tribute to the king (Hdt. 3.97). Diodorus Siculus, using Ctesias as his source, also mentions that the Arabians were unconquered by the Persians (D. S. 2.1.5). Moreover, India was conquered by Darius, not Cyrus, according to Herodotus (Hdt. 4.44). The king of India appears in the *Cyropaedia* as a wealthy and powerful ruler, who does not join the Assyrian expedition against the Medes and Persians, preferring to send an embassy to both the opposing camps, starting with the latter (2.4.1 ff.), in order to assess the merits of each side's cause. Cyrus takes the opportunity to impress his embassy with the efficiency of himself and his remodelled army. He anticipates the response of the Assyrian king to the embassy and flatters the Indian king by appealing to the latter's wisdom and moral superiority, saying that he will accept the Indian king as the judge of who is the injured party between the Assyrian and Median alliances (2.4.8). For the prince of a people who are renowned for their assiduous devotion to justice, to offer the Indian king a role of judge, *dikastēs*, in this conflict is an exceptional compliment. It is also a clever ploy by Cyrus to ensure that he builds his own alliance with the Indian king, outside of any links with the Medes (3.2.25), which gives him the financial support to enable him to cast off his dependence on his uncle Cyaxares to feed, arm and pay his army. As an ally and financial supporter of the Persian cause who is greatly respected by Cyrus (6.2.1-3) and not depicted elsewhere in the *Cyropaedia* as submitting or acquiescing to Persian overlordship, it is strange to find India among the list of conquered provinces by Cyrus. Xenophon's inclusion of Cyprus and Egypt as places conquered by Cyrus is also unhistorical. Cyprus is mentioned by Herodotus as being conquered by the Egyptian king Amasis (Hdt. 2.182), and later as a part of one of the Persian provinces of Darius (Hdt. 3.91); he also

describes at length in Book 3 the conquest of Egypt by Cyrus' son Cambyses. Furthermore, he does not mention either the Chaldaeans or the Cadusians in the list - two subject peoples who play a small but significant role in Cyrus' army.¹³

The fictional nature of the list of Cyrus' conquests highlights a singular aspect of his approach to known historical events in the *Cyropaedia*, and his deliberate avoidance of unpalatable historical facts, such as the rebellion led by Cyrus against the Medes. Xenophon neither claims that the *Cyropaedia* is a work of fiction, nor does he say that it is historically accurate.¹⁴ His references to Persian sources should be regarded as attempts to show his awareness of local accounts of Cyrus' life and to show some ethnic detail in the narrative, rather than proof of fidelity to historical facts (see Introduction D (i)). He is thus free to recreate Persian history as he sees fit, being well aware that there were already two conflicting accounts of Cyrus' life, by Herodotus and Ctesias, circulating in the Greek world, which he could draw upon to create the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* (see Introduction D (v)). Xenophon also avoids dealing with Cyrus' later career and conquests, which, as recounted by Herodotus, show the Persian king as a bloodthirsty and ruthless despot (see Appendix C). By listing Cyrus' achievements briefly at the start of the work, Xenophon does not have to go into detail at a later point in the narrative as to how Cyrus actually won these various lands, he can simply refer to a large-scale expedition which led to the creation of the huge Persian empire (8.6.20-21).

Once he has established the worthiness and greatness of Cyrus' reputation, Xenophon identifies three aspects of the Persian king's life which marked him out for greatness: his noble origins, *genea*, which automatically confer on him hereditary privileges and the respect of his own people; his own nature, *physis*, the personal qualities which ensure that he does not compromise the elevated position he has been born into, and serve to increase his stature, not only among his own people, but also among other nations; and finally his *paideia*, which can be loosely defined as his

¹³ See Tuplin 1990, 17 on the inconsistencies in Xenophon's list.

¹⁴ Stadter 1991, 461.

'education', not in the modern sense of childhood learning, but rather the sum total of his life experiences, the essence of which he expresses in his deathbed speech to his sons (see Appendix C). The emphasis on these three aspects of Cyrus' life should not be seen as arbitrary choices by Xenophon, but rather as a conscious attempt to follow the pattern of encomiastic literature in concentrating on certain well defined biographical areas, including the origins, character and education of the person being praised.¹⁵ Isocrates' *Evagoras*, one of the earliest extant examples of encomiastic literature, begins the actual eulogy of Evagoras by dealing with the birth and ancestry of the Cypriot king (*Ev.* 12), before moving on to describing his physical and mental attributes and his education (*ibid.* 22 ff.). Xenophon himself was well acquainted with the content and format of the prose *encomium*; the *Agesilaus* is his own contribution to this emerging genre of the fourth century and bears a striking similarity to the *Evagoras*.¹⁶ Moreover, in the *Anabasis* Xenophon breaks off from the narrative of the battle of Cunaxa to produce an *encomium* of Cyrus the Younger, which praises his upbringing and his character and deeds (*An.* 1.9.1 ff.).

The wide-ranging nature and the length of the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* are such that it has been regarded as a full-scale biography rather than an example of encomiastic literature.¹⁷ However, Xenophon decides to limit his coverage of Cyrus' career to illustrating specific areas of the Persian king's life. Instead of attempting a comprehensive coverage of every period from birth to death, he presents "four distinct phases of temporal development".¹⁸ Xenophon thus remains true to the conventions of selective biography employed in the *encomium*.¹⁹ Throughout the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon is dedicated to the task of highlighting and praising Cyrus' *genea*, *physis* and

¹⁵ Zimmerman 1989, 103 ff.

¹⁶ Gera 1993, 6 f.; Momigliano 1971, 50 goes as far as to say that Xenophon modelled the *Agesilaus* on Isocrates' work.

¹⁷ Momigliano *ibid.*, 54 f.

¹⁸ Stadter 1991, 474.

¹⁹ Gera 1993, 7.

paideia, precisely the elements which, in the *Oeconomicus*, Ischomachus identifies as being part of the nature of a king,

οὐ μέντοι μὰ Δία τοῦτό γε ἔτι ἐγὼ λέγω ἰδόντα μαθεῖν εἶναι, οὐδ' ἄπαξ ἀκούσαντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ παιδείας δεῖν φημι τῷ ταῦτα μέλλοντι δυνήσεσθαι καὶ φύσεως ἀγαθῆς ὑπάρχειν, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον δὴ θεῖον γενέσθαι. *Oec.* 21.11-12
However, by Zeus, I am still not saying that it is possible to learn this [the art of leadership] by seeing it, or by hearing it only once; but I am saying that the person who intends to possess these abilities needs education, and must possess the right kind of nature, and most important of all, he must be divine.²⁰

The impeccable nature of Cyrus' birth and upbringing in the *Cyropaedia* is recognised by Croesus in a statement which neatly summarises the nature of Cyrus' greatness,

πρῶτον μὲν ἐκ θεῶν γεγονότι, ἔπειτα δὲ διὰ βασιλέων πεφυκότι, ἔπειτα δ' ἐκ παιδὸς ἀρετὴν ἀσκοῦντι· τῶν δ' ἐμῶν προγόνων ἀκούω τὸν πρῶτον βασιλεύσαντα ἅμα βασιλέα τε καὶ ἐλεύθερον γενέσθαι. *Cyr.* 7.2.24

First of all you are descended from the gods, then by birth through kings, then from your childhood you have practised virtue; while I understand that the first of my ancestors to practise kingship became at one and the same time a king and free man.

Cyrus' fitness to rule and be a conqueror are thus emphasised in contrast to Croesus' own comparatively lowly lineage and credentials.²¹ Whereas Cyrus is of divine descent Croesus is descended from Gyges, the *tyrannos* who, in Herodotus' account of Lydian history, is a bodyguard of the king Candaules (Hdt. 1.8), and in Plato's *Republic* is a herdsman (*R.* 359C). Croesus' sincerity may be open to question,²² but his words demonstrate the effect Cyrus' reputation has had on a former adversary who is now humbled. The Mede Artabazus also pledges his loyalty to Cyrus because, above all, Cyrus is a descendant of the gods (4.1.24). Cyrus commands respect due to his upbringing and the fact that he comes from a long line of kings. Moreover, he is worthy of regal ancestry because he actively practises virtue, in the way that the Persian *paideia* demands from its pupils (e.g. 1.2.3 & 1.5.8).

²⁰ Trans. by Pomeroy 1994, 209.

²¹ Gera 1993, 276.

²² See Tatum 1989, 157.

Cyrus' noble lineage and exceptional physical beauty and mental abilities are simply stated by Xenophon (1.2.1). The question of what exactly constitutes Cyrus' *paideia* cannot be answered in such a concise manner. Werner Jaeger's definition of *paideia* as a process of 'enculturation', of moulding human character to make each individual in the image of the community,²³ is certainly applicable to Xenophon's description of the Persian educational process in chapter 2 of Book 1. The conclusion that Cyrus' *paideia* refers only to his childhood education, thus rendering the accepted title of the work, Κύρου παιδεία, appropriate only for Book 1,²⁴ has been convincingly argued against by recent scholars.²⁵ The education of Cyrus by others ends when he is sent off to assist the Medes against the Assyrians, but his *paideia* includes both childhood and adult achievements. Cyrus is characterised throughout the work by his willingness to educate himself by seeking out new and alien situations, which leads him to reject the opportunity to return home from Media to continue the strictly regimented Persian *paideia* (see Synopsis to chapter 3). He then applies the lessons of his early years in Persia and Media to the various situations which affect his adult life. In the eyes of Xenophon and his contemporary Greeks the whole of one's life was a learning process, and in an age where a man was extremely fortunate to live long enough to be classed as an 'elder' and possess the wisdom associated with advanced age, Cyrus counts himself to be fortunate to reach old age and to be able to pass on his wisdom to his sons (8.7.6 ff. - see Appendix C).

²³ Jaeger 1939, I, xxii ff.

²⁴ E.g. Jaeger 1945, III, 162 & Breitenbach 1966, 1707.

²⁵ Tatum 1989, 90 f. & Due 1989, 15.

1. Ἐννοιά ποθ' ἡμιν ἐγένετο ... : Xenophon's opening line is a typically oblique way of introducing his subject (cf. *Lac.* 1.1, his opening line, “Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐννοήσας ποτέ ...” - see Due 1989, 16 n.). The *Cyropaedia* is presented as being the result of momentary inspiration on the part of the author, but such apparent modesty on Xenophon's part only thinly disguises the obvious fact that the work is the fruit of a lifetime of experience and thought on the question of leadership. Xenophon's use of the first person plural, “ἡμῖν”, is typical of his unobtrusive authorial presence throughout the narrative of the *Cyropaedia*, and is a way of inviting his audience to participate in his assessment of the problems of leadership and in his praise of Cyrus' achievements. Herodotus and Thucydides introduce themselves at the beginning of their works and regularly offer personal opinions in the first person singular, whereas Xenophon on the whole uses third person narrative, and only occasionally ventures an opinion in the first person plural (e.g. 8.1.17 & 8.6.16-17 - see Due 1989, 31 n. for examples). He also, in at least eight instances, uses the first person singular (3.3.59, 8.2.6, 8.2.7, 8.2.12, 8.8.2, 8.8.8, 8.8.16 & 8.8.27 - Due *ibid.* notes only three examples). The last four instances are particularly significant as they occur in the final chapter of the work, when the main narrative of the *Cyropaedia* has been concluded. Xenophon switches to the first person singular in order to deliver his own personal opinions on the degeneracy of the contemporary generation of Persians.

δημοκρατία: Xenophon makes his work relevant to his Greek audience as soon as possible by moving straight into a discussion of Greek forms of government, before introducing the figure of Cyrus. The first constitution to be mentioned is appropriately the one Xenophon had first knowledge of; he had witnessed at first hand the destabilising factors inherent in the democracy practised in Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian War, which he describes in Book 1 of the *Hellenica* and for which he proposes some solutions in the *Poroi* (*Vect.* 1.1 ff.).

πολιτεύεσθαι: Xenophon does not use the word in the simple sense of ‘to live’, as Miller translates (Miller 1914, 2), but in the literal sense of ‘to take part in government’ as a

free citizen (see *LSJ* s.v. B I-III), which an Athenian citizen could expect to do, and which had been denied to Xenophon as a consequence of his exile. Just like Herodotus and Thucydides, Xenophon was prevented from returning to his native state. This period of exile gave all three authors a detached perspective, from which they could view the convoluted history of the Greek peoples with some degree of clarity, denied to their contemporaries.

μοναρχίαι ... ὀλιγαρχίαι ... τυραννεῖν: The scope of Xenophon's argument broadens to include three other forms of government, which had all been experienced and rejected by Athens (Bizos 1971, I, 1 n.), though there is no reason to suppose that he is specifically addressing the Athenians here as these types of government were also part of the experience of the other *poleis* of Greece. Xenophon's use of *monarchia* instead of *basileia* is unusual (Holden 1887, 88); he uses the latter term in a parallel passage in the *Agesilaus* that contrasts the stability of the Spartan government with the same four forms of government, democracy, oligarchy, tyranny and kingship, "βασίλεια" (*Ages.* 1.4). In the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon is about to launch on a work glorifying an archetypal *basileus*, Cyrus, so he may have been unwilling to use the term here in this particular context; he also avoids using the term when Cyrus is first introduced to the work (see 1.1.3).

οἱ μὲν ... ταχὺ πάμπαν κατελύθησαν: Tyrannical government, which is not based on ancestral or constitutional claims to power, is thus portrayed as the most vulnerable to overthrow by the people. Xenophon seems to be referring here to the central theme of his dialogue *Hiero* which highlights the precarious and unsatisfactory nature of tyrannical rule (cf. also his final condemnatory words about tyranny in the *Oeconomicus* (*Oec.* 21.12)).

θαυμάζονται ὥς σοφοί τε καὶ εὐτυχεῖς ἄνδρες: Xenophon continues his allusions to the *Hiero*. The difference between the public perception of the tyrant, expressed by Simonides, as a *thauma* an object of wonder and envy for his riches (*Hier.* 1.8-9),

contrasts sharply with the tyrant's own view of his situation, burdened with absolute power, unable to trust anyone or to enjoy his material riches (*ibid.* 7.10).

ἐν ἰδίοις οἴκοις: Xenophon extends his argument on the instability of government, to make it even more relevant to his readers by discussing the difficulties involved in a master controlling his household, a theme which he covers in the *Oeconomicus*.

... τοὺς δεσπότας: Cf. 8.2.4 on how Cyrus secures the goodwill of his servants by having their food served from his table, thus acting as a successful *despotēs* in his household. He is a master who is able to show kindness but is also able to exert his authority over those under him, unlike the ineffective masters referred to here.

2. νομεῖς ... νομίζονται: Xenophon indulges in a play on words to highlight the link between the herdsman, *nomeus*, and law, *nomos*. The herdsman dispenses pasturage to his herds in the same way as the ruler dispenses laws to his people. Xenophon makes the important point that animals let their leaders enjoy, and use as they will, the profits of their association, “τοῖς καρποῖς”. The harmonious relationship between herd and the herdsman, and the fidelity shown by the beasts to their keepers is in stark contrast to the relationship between the ruler and his subjects (cf. Isocrates' *To Nicocles*, where the same opinion is expressed (*Ad. Nic.* 12)). The benefits reaped by mankind from keeping livestock are mentioned by Socrates in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 4.3.10). Xenophon draws another analogy between the human and animal worlds in the *Hiero*, when the poet Simonides speaks of some human beings who are like horses, because they become more unmanageable the more they get what they want (*Hier.* 10.2-3).

3. ὥς ἄνθρωπῳ πεφύκεται ... : There follows a bald statement of fact no doubt familiar to all those who debated methods of governing and the best kind of *politeia* - man is inclined by nature to disobey authority, whereas animals who are mentally inferior to their herdsman willingly submit to his authority. Man, who perceives himself as mentally and physically equal to his leaders, is naturally difficult to control.

Κῦρος ἐγένετο Πέρσης: The main character of the *Cyropaedia* is introduced with deliberate ambiguity (See 1.4.27 on the withholding of the name of the character Artabazus for dramatic effect). Xenophon is being deliberately imprecise, playing on the association between the Cyrus the king with Cyrus the Younger, the prince whose aspirations and personal qualities, if Xenophon is to be believed in the *Anabasis*, matched those of his namesake (see Pomeroy 1994, 248-250 for a discussion of the deliberate blurring of the identity of the two Cyruses in Greek literature). The Greeks were accustomed to referring to the Persian king simply as the king, *basileus* (usually without the definite article). Xenophon does not use the term *basileus* here to describe Cyrus, perhaps because the majority of the *Cyropaedia* covers the period when Cyrus was still a prince of the Persians, and also possibly in order to differentiate him from his successors to the Persian throne, whose achievements are conveniently ignored in order to magnify those of Cyrus (see Synopsis).

ἐκτίσαστο πειθομένους ... : At the earliest possible opportunity the author makes the subtle but significant distinction between Cyrus and the unsuccessful rulers characterised in his opening statement. Cyrus is described as ‘reducing to obedience’ his subject peoples, not just conquering them; which makes the nature of his power closer to that of the herdsmen and their flocks, who have been described as willingly obeying their human overlord “ἐθελοῦσας πείθεσθαι”. The theme of gaining obedience of one’s subjects, and above all willing obedience, is central to the *Cyropaedia* and Xenophon’s other works (see 1.6.21).

οὔτε τῶν ἀδυνάτων οὔτε ... : Xenophon uses two double negatives to emphasise the reversal of his former, pessimistic conclusion, not only is it not impossible to rule men but it is not even difficult when one considers the inspiring example set by Cyrus.

ἐπισταμένως: Xenophon refers to the particular skill, the *epistēmē* of ruling, which is the essence of the work and which Xenophon will endeavour to reveal (see Synopsis). The same idea of a king ruling with knowledge, *epistamenōs*, is expressed as early as

ὁ δ' ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύων
αἰψά τε καὶ μέγα νεῖκος ἐπισταμένως κατέπαυσεν. *Th.* 86-87
And he, speaking without faltering,
Quickly and skilfully puts an end to even great strife.

4. τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων... : Xenophon makes a clear distinction between kings who have inherited power and those who have acquired it, between the established ruler who has a legitimate right to rule based on ancestral claims and the newcomer who has fought his way to the top. Cyrus is in effect a composite ruler: he both inherits the throne of Persia from his father but also acquires an empire in his own right. The dual nature of his kingship is reflected in his approach to gaining power; behind the figure of the hereditary prince exercising his ancestral claims there is also a newcomer, willing to go against convention to secure what he wants.

ὁ Σκύθης ... ὁ Θράξ ... ὁ Ἰλλυριός: Xenophon refers to the kings of the several nations which constituted the barbarian peoples in closest proximity to the Greek world, before proceeding to list various distant, and to his Greek audience, exotic, peoples conquered by Cyrus.

ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ ... αὐτόνομα: The continued resistance of the peoples of Europe to any form of overlordship is alluded to by Xenophon. The separate natures of the continents of Europe and Asia, and the ancient hostility between their respective inhabitants is the central theme of the *proemium* to Herodotus' work (Hdt. 1.1-5).

ἔτι καὶ νῦν: This phrase recurs throughout the narrative of the *Cyropaedia*. It is a prominent motif used by Xenophon to link between present and past in order to stress the permanence and greatness of Cyrus' achievements (see Due 1989, 33 ff. for examples and analysis).

οὖν ὀλίγη ... στρατιᾶ: The extent of Cyrus' achievements is magnified by the small army he had at his disposal against enemies who have far greater numbers. As Xenophon

proceeds to show in the *Cyropaedia*, the compact nature of Cyrus' army is its strength in the beginning (see Synopsis to chapter 5 & 1.6.10 on the smallness of Cyrus' army). He is better placed to reform, rearm and train his army, to compensate for its lack of manpower, than the Assyrian king and Croesus, leaders of the unwieldy, disorganised masses which are beaten by the Persians and their allies. Isocrates, in the *Evagoras*, takes a completely different view of Cyrus, belittling the Persian's achievements when comparing them with the deeds of Evagoras (*Ev.* 37-38).

ἐκόντων μὲν ἡγήσατο Μήδων ... : Cyrus' acquisitions and conquests are listed in the manner reminiscent of Herodotus' list of the peoples of Darius' empire (*Hdt.* 3.88 ff.) and his catalogue of the contingents of Xerxes' expedition (*Hdt.* 7.61 ff.), to give an impression of the magnitude of his empire. Xenophon later lists some of these conquered peoples as being governed by satraps (8.6.7). Historically, the Medes did not consent to Persian rule (see Synopsis). Cyrus secures the willing obedience of his allies by undermining the role of their king Cyaxares, whose soldiers transfer their allegiance to Cyrus at the first available opportunity (4.2.10 ff.). His annexation of Media is officially confirmed when Cyaxares, who does not have a male heir, gives his daughter in marriage to Cyrus and offers Media as her dowry (8.5.19).

ἐκόντων δὲ Ὑρκανίων: The Hyrcanians are later described as subjects of the Assyrians (1.5.2). Xenophon refers to them as good horsemen who are entrusted with guarding the rear of the Assyrian army (4.2.1). After the defeat and death of the Assyrian king they choose to defect to the Persians (4.2.3 ff. & 4.2.19) and play a prominent role in Cyrus' army.

Σύρους, Ἀσσυρίους: The Syrians are differentiated from their eastern neighbours, the Assyrians and are later described as subjects of the Assyrian king (1.5.2), before their eventual subjugation by Cyrus (8.6.20). Xenophon presents them as being wealthy and having fertile land (5.2.12 & 6.2.22). Elsewhere in the narrative Xenophon does not distinguish between them and the Assyrians, and he consequently refers to 'Syria' when

in fact he is referring to Assyria (e.g. 5.4.51 & 6.1.27). The lax use of ethnic names by Xenophon, who otherwise demonstrates a good knowledge of Near Eastern customs and of some words and expressions (Hirsch 1985, 149 & Due 1989, 141 ff.), is typical of the Greek tendency not to differentiate strictly between ethnically-related peoples of the Near East, the use of Medes for Persian being the most common example (see below).

The Assyrians in the *Cyropaedia* correspond to the Babylonians in Herodotus' work, not the historical Assyrians who dominated the Near East before their overthrow by the Medes at the end of the seventh century. The interchangeability in the Greek use of 'Assyrian' and 'Babylonian' for the inhabitants of Babylon is reminiscent of the similar confusion of 'Mede' and 'Persian' in Herodotus' work, and in other Greek literature. The Babylonians are referred to as 'Assyrians' by Herodotus when he recounts the siege of the city by Darius' army (Hdt. 3.151 ff.). The Persian Zopyrus, who devises a bizarre and personally injurious stratagem in order to gain access to the city, claims he is motivated by his inability to bear the thought of his king 'being mocked by Assyrians' (Hdt. 3.155). The relatively prominent role of the Assyro-Babylonians in the *Cyropaedia* as enemies of the Medes and Persians (see Synopsis to chapter 5) is not reflected in the *Anabasis*. Xenophon makes no mention of the former greatness of Babylon or of Assyrian civilization; the Assyrians only appear once, as mercenaries in the Persian king's army (*An.* 7.8.15). When Xenophon himself sees the ruins of their great cities, Calah and Nineveh, in the course of the retreat of the Ten Thousand, he limits himself to saying that they were formerly inhabited by the Medes (*An.* 3.4.7 & 10). This omission is possibly due to the context of the passage in the *Anabasis*; Xenophon may have chosen, in a passage dealing with the Persian conquest of Media, to concentrate on these two peoples to the exclusion of the Assyrians.

'Αραβίους: See Synopsis on the inclusion of the Arabians in the list. The Arabians are former vassals of the Assyrian king (1.5.2), whose king, Araragdus, supplies men for the Assyrian campaign against the Medes (2.1.5), and is killed in the flight from the Assyrian camp (4.2.31). They reappear in the narrative as part of Croesus' army (6.2.10), and,

after the fall of Sardis, are conquered by Cyrus (7.4.16). They are later mentioned as soldiers in Cyrus' army during the siege of Babylon (7.5.14).

Καππαδόκας, Φρύγας ἀμφοτέρους: Both peoples contribute men to the armies that oppose Cyrus (1.5.2-3 & 6.2.10), before being subdued by him (7.4.16).

Κᾶρας, Φοίνικας: The Carians feature not only as part of the army of the Assyrian king (1.5.3), but also as a people who appeal to Cyrus to arbitrate in a civil war (7.4.1 ff.). Cyrus sends an envoy, Adusius, who settles their dispute, thus ensuring their loyalty to Persia, and later becomes their satrap (8.6.7). The Phoenicians, primarily a seafaring nation, do not have a role in the entirely land-based warfare of the *Cyropaedia*, and only appear one more time in the narrative as part of Croesus' army (6.2.10).

Βακτρίων καὶ Ἰνδῶν καὶ Κιλικίων: The Bactrians are one of the peoples mentioned as serving in the first Assyrian army (1.5.2); Abradatas is introduced as being absent during the first battle between the Assyrians and the Medes/Persians because he was on embassy to Bactria (5.1.3). See Synopsis for discussion of the role of the Indian king in the *Cyropaedia*. The Cilicians change allegiance to Cyrus following the defeat of Croesus, and their subsequent zeal in the Persian cause ensures that they are never directly governed by one of Cyrus' satraps (7.4.1-2 & 8.6.8).

Σακῶν καὶ Παφλαγόνων καὶ Μαγαδιδῶν: Cyrus has an early introduction to the Sacians when he comes into conflict with a Sacian slave at Astyages' court (1.3.8-14). They are later described as enemies of the Assyrians, having resisted attempts by the latter to subjugate them (5.2.25), and consequently are willing participants in Cyrus' expedition against Croesus and the Assyrians (5.3.24). The Paphlagonians, after having been part of the initial Assyrian force (1.5.2), are later rewarded for joining the Babylonian expedition of their own accord by not being governed by a satrap (8.6.8). The Magadidae are an otherwise unknown people, perhaps invented by Xenophon, who goes on to comment that Cyrus' realm was so vast that there were peoples in it who were

beyond the knowledge of the Greeks, and were also impossible to name by the author.

Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ: The Asiatic Greeks, including the Aeolians and Ionians, are later mentioned as subjects of Croesus, who serve in his army (6.2.10).

Κυπρίων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων: See Synopsis on the historical inclusion of Cyprus and Egypt in the Persian empire. In the *Cyropaedia* the Cyprians benefit from the same arrangement as the Cilicians and Paphlagonians, in being allowed to govern themselves but at the same time sending financial tribute to Cyrus (7.4.2). The Egyptians play a more prominent role in the work as mercenaries in Croesus' army (6.2.10), who distinguish themselves in battle through their bravery (7.1.30-40). Cyrus is moved to spare their lives and offers the surviving soldiers the opportunity to settle in his empire as his subjects, which they readily accept (7.1.45). Xenophon later mentions in passing that Cyrus subjugated Egypt in one of his great expeditions (8.6.20).

5. φόβος: Fear is listed as the first constituent of Cyrus' power, which enables him to rule such a large area. In the *Memorabilia* Socrates tells Pericles' son that the atmosphere of fear which prevails in Athens during the Peloponnesian War, and which is in contrast to the normal Athenian self-confidence, is more suitable for the rule of a good man, as it renders the people more attentive, obedient and more able to be organised, “ὁ δὲ φόβος προσεκτικωτέρους τε καὶ εὐπειθεστέρους καὶ εὐτακτοτέρους ποιεῖ” (*Mem.* 3.5.5).

χαρίζεσθαι ... κυβερνᾶσθαι: Cyrus' rule of fear is tempered by the image of a benevolent king that he projects, which convinces those under him that they are better off in submitting to him. This submission in effect means a surrender of their own initiative and desire for self-determination which become subsumed in Cyrus' scheme for governing his dominions. He is their *kybernētēs*, the helmsman to whom they entrust the running of their *poleis* (see 1.6.6 for another naval analogy).

ἀπὸ τῶν βασιλείων: Xenophon creates here the image of the royal palace, as the centre

of an empire from which Cyrus' influence radiated in every direction to the furthest corners and most remote peoples. Cyrus makes his home in Babylon, as his father remains in power in Persia, and he wishes to remain free from paternal interference in his organisation of his palace and empire. The former seat of his Assyrian rivals is conveniently located at the geographical centre of his empire, and Xenophon states that Cyrus spent seven months of the year there and divided the other five months between the Median capital city Ecbatana and also Susa in order to ensure that he avoided extremes of climate (8.6.22 - see Cook 1983, 33 for literary and historical evidence of Cyrus' use of the palaces at Babylon and Ecbatana).

6. θαυμάζεσθαι: Xenophon conveys the idea of Cyrus' career as a *thauma*, in particular his mastery of the art of ruling other men, a task worthy of admiration (see 1.1.1). *Thauma* is the highest word of praise for showing the impact of someone on the outside world, and its association with Cyrus is a sign of the divine support of his rule (cf. the funeral oration of Pericles in Thucydides' work, in which he confidently predicts that the Athenians would be a source of wonder not only for the present generation but also for future generations of mankind, "τοῖς τε νῦν καὶ τοῖς ἔπειτα θαυμασθησόμεθα" (Thuc. 2.41)). An anonymous member of Cyrus' army seeks to reassure the recently captured Panthea that she has nothing to fear having become the property of Cyrus because if there is any man worthy of admiration, "ἄξιός ἐστι θαυμάζεσθαι", it is the Persian prince (1.5.6).

τὶς ποτ' ὦν γενεὰν ... φύσιν: The first two distinguishing elements in Cyrus' greatness are the most overlooked area when studying the *Cyropaedia*, but his noble birth plays an important part in determining his career. His nobility preordains him for a life as a leader, conferring upon him respect and privilege by virtue of his parentage and ancestry (see Synopsis). Cyrus does not lapse into complacency and assume that he commands respect simply by virtue of his superior birth, but works hard to ensure that he continues to keep and increase the respect held for him by his subjects. His high birth is more than matched by his inner qualities, his noble *physis*, which is not conferred on him because

he is a prince but is his own unique character. In Xenophon's account of Prodicus' tale of Heracles being tested by Virtue and Vice, Virtue introduces herself to Heracles and hopes that he will follow the path that leads to her because she is aware of his birth and his nature during the time of his education, "εἰδυῖα τοὺς γεννήσαντάς σε καὶ τὴν φύσιν τὴν σὴν ἐν τῇ παιδείᾳ καταμαθοῦσα" (*Mem.* 2.1.27).

ποιᾶ τινὶ παιδευθεὶς παιδεῖα ... : The third and most important element in Cyrus' greatness (see Synopsis for discussion of the meaning of the term).

ὅσα οὖν καὶ ἐπυθόμεθα καὶ ἡσθήσθαι δοκοῦμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ: The final sentence of the introduction is an explanation of Xenophon's approach to creating his figure of Cyrus. Having established Cyrus' greatness and the three particular areas of his life which are worthy of investigation, Xenophon promises that, 'all that we have learnt about him and all that we think that we can say about him we shall now try to present'. Such a statement of intent is designed to show that the *Cyropaedia* is the product of Xenophon's own learning and inquiries, "ἐπυθόμεθα", but is also the product of his own opinions and judgement, which he feels entitled to make, "ἡσθήσθαι δοκοῦμεν". Xenophon uses the verb *dokein* to express his own judgement in the same way that Thucydides uses the verb, "ὥς δ' ἂν ἐδόκουν μοι" to state that he uses his own judgement for reconstructing the speeches in his work although he claims not to have done this in the case of the events that he records (*Thuc.* 1.22). The author of the *Cyropaedia* thus signals his intention to diverge from existing accounts of Cyrus' life where necessary in order to convey his own impression of what Cyrus must have been like.

Chapter 2

Synopsis

Xenophon now proceeds to discuss the Persian *paideia* and *politeia*, which are deliberately and inextricably linked to produce a stable society of obedient citizens. His analysis of their educational system is brief, but his treatment of their constitution is even briefer, as he himself admits (1.2.15). In such a didactic work as the *Cyropaedia* the author's brevity on these subjects may seem initially surprising, and it has led to the view that the work is disappointing as a work on education.¹ Xenophon shows himself to be more concerned with the concepts and values that lay behind the Persian *paideia* and in the *politeia* - which he will illustrate through the conduct of Cyrus and the other Persians throughout the narrative - than in actually giving detailed account of educational practices and constitutional framework. Moreover, he does not want to devote too much space to detailing the structure of Persian society, when he wants to concentrate on one highly successful individual, Cyrus, who forges a career through circumventing the whole Persian system and creating his own altered version of it on a much grander scale (see below).²

Chapter 2 begins with a description of Cyrus' noble lineage and his impressive physical and mental attributes (1.2.1). Xenophon eliminates any mention of a peasant upbringing, a theme which figures prominently in both Herodotus' and Ctesias' accounts of his life, in order to stress the impeccable nature of Cyrus' birth and upbringing. He is not interested in demonstrating the moral worth of the lower orders, the 'commoners' (*dēmotai*), with the notable exception of Pheraulas, who wins Cyrus' favour and rises through the ranks of the Persian army.³ Although it is significant that Pheraulas is portrayed as being intelligent and noble in spite of, rather than because of, his lowly

¹ Jaeger 1945, III, 162.

² Gera 1993, 289 f. notes that, "Cyrus' court in Babylon is not run in the same way as the Persian court described by Xenophon at the beginning of the *Cyropaedia* (1.2.2-15)".

³ See Gera 1993, 173 ff. & Due 1989, 73 ff. on the character of Pheraulas.

origins (2.3.7).

Xenophon's version of the Persian *paideia* is divided up into four distinct chronological stages: the class of boys, *paides*, which starts at an unspecified age and ends at the age of sixteen or seventeen; the class of youths, *ephēboi*, which ends at twenty-six or twenty-seven; the class of adults, *teleioi andres*, who stay in this class for twenty-five years; and the elders, *presbyteroi*, who become part of this class at the age of fifty-one or fifty-two and presumably remain there until death. Education is controlled by the Persian state and in accordance with the Persian laws, and takes place in isolation from the day to day life of the *polis* (1.2.2-4). Xenophon notes that there are officers appointed who control each age group (1.2.5). These officers are drawn from the twelve Persian tribes, and are later referred to as tribal leaders, *phylarchoi* (1.2.14); there are no *paidagogoi*, and the teachers, who are mentioned later in the narrative, are presumably subordinate to the *phylarchoi*. The elders are seen as the best leaders of the boys, the adult men control the youths, whilst the men and the elders appoint leaders chosen from their own age groups. The Persians thus remain under some form of supervision throughout their life in order to ensure that they are best possible citizens. Xenophon's approach to describing the Persian *paideia* is carefully structured in the way he introduces concepts and shows how Persian education was moulded to promote them. The boys attend schools to learn justice through acting out mock trials, as well as learning the core values of gratitude, mental and physical self-control (*sōphrosynē* and *enkrateia*), and the practical skills of archery and spear-throwing (1.2.6-8). The youths develop these skills by guarding the *polis* at night and during the day accompany the king on hunting expeditions in order to toughen themselves for future military expeditions (1.2.9-11). They also practise their archery and spear-throwing, and display these skills in public competitions, which are conducted on a tribal basis, as well as being available for garrison duty and other tasks (1.2.12). The men spend their twenty-five years being available for military service as infantrymen, armed with shield and sword (1.2.13). Finally, the elders spend their time as a judicial body who appoint the officers of state (1.2.14). They also listen to cases of complaint brought by the *phylarchoi* against youths and adults and have the power to expel and

disenfranchise offenders.

The *politeia* is dealt with quickly; Xenophon notes that the population of the Persians is about 120,000 (1.2.15). He stresses that although the education is open to all (male) Persians, only those whose parents can afford not to send their children out to work are actually able to receive it. Moreover, each male citizen has to complete each stage of the *paideia* in order to move on to the next stage in order to attain the summit of their *paideia*, the honour of becoming an elder. The effects of the Persian education can be still be observed in their strict code of personal conduct and abstemious lifestyle (1.2.16).

Xenophon's picture of Persian *paideia* contains the educational elements of learning practical skills, such as shooting and throwing, and of learning justice, self-restraint and physical endurance, which are found in other Greek accounts of Persian education and bear a strong resemblance to Persian and Near Eastern inscriptions relating to the education of kings.⁴ In Book 1 of the *Anabasis* Xenophon gives another account of Persian *paideia*, by describing Cyrus the Younger's education, in his *encomium* of the Persian prince (*An.* 1.9.1 ff.). Cyrus the Younger is educated alongside the sons of the Persian nobles at the king's court, away from all that is shameful in society; there he learns *sōphrosynē*, how to obey and how to command, archery, spear-throwing and hunting - all of which is very similar to what occurs in chapter 2 of the *Cyropaedia*. There is no mention of learning justice in the *Anabasis*; but Cyrus the Younger is portrayed in the *encomium* and throughout the work as a paragon of justice. Horse-riding plays a big part in the education of Cyrus the Younger but has not been adopted by the Persians of chapter 2 of the *Cyropaedia*; it is only when Cyrus decides that the peers and himself should become mounted soldiers (4.3.4) that horse-riding becomes an integral part of the Persian lifestyle. Herodotus' description of Persian *nomoi* also includes a note to the effect that the Persians are educated from the ages of five to twenty in only three things: horse-riding, archery and telling the truth (Hdt.

⁴ See Gera 1993, 158 n.; for Greek and non-Greek sources on Persian education I am indebted to a paper "Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*" given in 1995 by Prof. C. Tuplin at the 4th Symposium of the Nottingham Classical Literature Seminar.

1.136). An emphasis on telling the truth in Persian education can also be found in Nicolaus of Damascus' version of Ctesias' *Persika* - Cyrus is mentioned as having been taught *philosophia* by the Magi, as well as learning justice and truth in accordance with the Persian laws (*FrGH* 90 F67).

The works of later writers on Persian education and customs confirm the essential details of the accounts of Persian *nomoi* by Herodotus and Xenophon. The pseudo-Platonic dialogue the *Alcibiades I*, which was written at a later date than the *Cyropaedia*, gives an account of the education of the heir to the Persian throne which also highlights the combination of practical and ethical skills of Xenophon's account of Persian *paideia*, as well as mentioning a role for the Magi in the education of the prince (*Alc. I* 121D ff.). Strabo, in his account of *ta ethē ta Persika* in the *Geographica* (Str. 15.3.13 ff.), describes Persian education in similar terms to Herodotus, adding only spear-throwing to the basic elements of Persian *paideia* (Str. 15.3.18), but also adds details recognisable from the *Cyropaedia* such as the emphasis on physical fitness and frugal diet, hunting and athletic competitions (Str. *ibid.*).

Xenophon's Persian *paideia* also contains elements which are recognisably Greek, and which are particularly reminiscent of the education of the Spartans, the *agōgē*, he describes in the *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia*. He was not alone in linking Spartan and Persian institutions; the *Alcibiades I* also draws comparisons between the kings of Sparta and Persia, showing how their superiority is derived from their birth and upbringing (*Alc. I* 121B). Strabo describes Persian boys called 'Cardaces', who live and sleep outdoors and are trained to survive by stealing to supplement their diet (Str. 15.3.18); the education of the Cardaces is reminiscent of the Spartan education of the *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia* with its emphasis on boys learning to thief successfully (*Lac.* 2.6-7). Arrian also notes in his *Anabasis* that the Persians at the time of Cyrus were poor people who lived in rough country and had institutions, *nomima*, which were extremely close to the Spartan system of education, *paideusis* (Arr. *An.* 5.4.5). The similarities between Persian education in the *Cyropaedia* and his description of

education in the Spartan state are obvious.⁵ In the *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia* Xenophon begins his explanation of the education reforms of Lycurgus that have remained in force to the present day, by commenting that Sparta differs from the other Greek states by making education the responsibility of the state not the parent (*Lac.* 2.1 ff.). The Spartans also have a four-tiered educational system of boys, youths, adults and elders, which inculcates the same values as Xenophon's Persians, and which emphasises the importance of learning ethical values alongside physical discipline and training. The Spartan regime is noted for its severity and emphasis on producing boys who are *philoponoi*, who can endure pain and privation, and who are also resourceful and respectful of the others (*ibid.*, 2.3-6). Further parallels between Sparta and Persia emerge in chapter 6 of the *Cyropaedia* when Cyrus and Cambyses discuss religious and military training, both of which are not covered in chapter 2. Cambyses' discussion of employing deceit and cunning learnt during hunting expeditions in warfare is paralleled by the Spartan emphasis on teaching their young to steal and to be cunning in order to be resourceful in obtaining supplies and to be better soldiers (*Lac.* 2.7).

The Persian education in chapter 2 of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* is delineated as a hybrid of the best of Persian and Spartan education, whose principles are held to be worthy and successful in producing good citizens (1.2.15-16; cf. *Lac.* 2.14). Above all, Xenophon aims to recreate a model monarchic *polis* in accordance with the Socratic principle of kingship expressed in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 4.6.12).⁶ The influence of Xenophon's native *polis* of Athens - the centre of *paideia* for the Greek world in the fifth and fourth centuries - on chapter 2 is not immediately apparent. Xenophon displays an interest in Athenian education in his other works. He is critical of the educational practices of the sophists who taught in his native *polis* (e.g. *Cyn.* 13.1 ff.). In the *Poroi* he seems to be referring to the Athenian institution of *ephēbeia*, when he argues that an improvement in public finances will result in citizens being better prepared for warfare and being more willing to carry out physical training and garrison duty (*Vect.* 4.51-52

⁵ Miller 1914, I, viii f.

⁶ See also Tuplin 1990, 20 on Xenophon's Socratic ideal on kingship.

ff.). The garrison duties of the Persian youths of the *Cyropaedia* are reminiscent of the functions carried out by the Athenian *ephēbes* described in the Aristotelian *Athenaiōn Politeia* (*Ath.* 42.1 ff.). The *ephēbeia* was not formally instituted until the latter half of the fourth century,⁷ however, the Athenian orator Aeschines, who was born c. 390 B.C., refers in one of his speeches to serving in a capacity similar to that of an *ephēbe* at the age of eighteen, guarding the borders of Attica (*Aeschin.* 2.167), so some kind of military cadetship probably existed in Athens by the time Xenophon composed the *Cyropaedia*.

Bizos rejects any association between the Persian *ephēboi* of the *Cyropaedia* and the Athenian *ephēbeia*, primarily on the grounds that the latter only spanned two years, between the ages of eighteen and twenty;⁸ and yet Xenophon, in keeping with his immediate introduction of the *politeia* debate in chapter 1, is constantly seeking to make his account of Cyrus' life and his discussion of Persian institutions relevant to his Greek audience, of which Athenians would have been a major part. Bizos does acknowledge that Xenophon's criticism of *poleis* that allow education to be left to the individual rather than the state (1.2.3), has particular relevance for the Athenians.⁹ By introducing such criticisms Xenophon seems to be addressing directly an argument advanced in Thucydides' account of Pericles' funeral oration. Pericles claims that Athenian education is superior to the regimented and arduous Spartan education, because Athenian citizens are just as brave and resourceful with their unregulated *paideusis*, but do not have to suffer the self-inflicted miseries of the Spartan education system (*Thuc.* 2.39). The same distrust of unregulated education appears in the *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia*, when Xenophon presents his analysis of the Spartan educational system for boys by comparing it favourably to the inadequate systems employed by other Greek *poleis* in general (*Lac.* 2.14).

It could be argued that the system outlined in chapter 2 as being the Persian

⁷ See entry for 'Epheboi' by F.A.G. Beck in the *OCD* 2nd ed.

⁸ Bizos 1971, I, 5 n.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 4 n.

system of education is presented as a hypothetical, if somewhat extreme, solution to the problems inherent in the majority of *poleis*, including Athens. The Persian system of *paideia* resembles the Greek ideal of *kalokagathia* which Xenophon espoused in his works, and regarded as prerequisite of kingship (*Ages.* 11.6),¹⁰ and promotes values which are conducive to the orderly running of society. Xenophon could be arguing, taking as his model the Persian society of the *Cyropaedia* and also the the Spartan society of the *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia*, for a more proactive rather than reactive way of running Greek *poleis*; where laws governing both young and old are not there purely for punishment, but for education, and are based on a set of common principles. Such a view is typical of one who had pursued a military career, and had served the Spartan state in an environment where adult men were subject to strict discipline and were encouraged to pursue common goals.

There is another side to Xenophon's depiction of the idealised Persian and Spartan societies. Both the *Cyropaedia* and the *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia* contain passages which comment on the degeneracy of the contemporary generations of both peoples (8.8.1 ff. & *Lac.* 14.1 ff.). Although the educational systems of both systems have been preserved, they have not been able to prevent corruption of men as the growth of their supremacy over their neighbours has rendered them susceptible to the temptations of power and money. In chapter 2 of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon portrays a society with a rigid structure, incapable of change and designed to stifle individuality among its citizens through the universal authority of its laws. The Persian abhorrence of ingratitude, *acharistia*, controls the acquisitive impulses of the citizens and prevents them from being distracted by wealth and luxury in what is a comparatively poor and isolated country. The result is that Persia remains a stable but minor power, vulnerable to attack from outside powers (e.g. 1.5.3 & 8.7.7).

There is no place in such a society for a king, such as Cyrus, who rules by virtue of his *epistēmē* (see Synopsis to chapter 1), not through blind adherence to the laws, and who has ambitions for his people beyond maintaining the *status quo*. Xenophon's

¹⁰ See also Jaeger 1945, III, 162.

portrayal of the career of Cyrus is of a ruler who is able to bypass the restrictions of his native *paideia* and *politeia* to suit his own needs. Moreover, the 'Education of Cyrus' is not the education of the Persians described in Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia*. Cyrus' education is unique in that he spends four years of his early teens - a crucial period in terms of education (see 1.2.9) - in Media at the court of his grandfather Astyages, king of the Medes (1.3.1 ff. - see Synopsis to chapter 3). In Media he learns to criticise and re-evaluate the education he has undergone in Persia by educating himself through observing the customs of the Median court and by seeking out a range of experiences denied to him in Persia. The effect of his self-education on his values and his attitude to power, which are directly opposed to traditional Persian conservatism, becomes apparent when he reaches manhood. His speech to the peers on the eve of the expedition against the Assyrians (1.5.7 ff. - see Synopsis to chapter 5), and his conversation with his father, who is a representative of old Persian values (1.6.2 ff. - see Synopsis to chapter 6), highlight the contrast in Cyrus' vision of Persian power with that of the Persian *paideia* of Book 1.

Once Cyrus is away from Persia with his own army he is able to organise it and educate it in accordance with his own ideals of *paideusis*. The rigid divisions in Persian society between the educated 'peers', *homotimoi*, and the *dēmotai* are publicly removed, and Cyrus rewards and promotes individual soldiers on merit (2.1.11 ff.). The principles behind Cyrus' reorganisation of his army are embodied in the creation of his vast empire, based in Babylon, and the administration of this empire, described in detail in Book 8 (8.1.6 ff.), bears minimal resemblance to the Persian *politeia* outlined in Book 1. However, Cyrus also continues publicly to espouse traditional Persian values in order to maintain stability and continuity during the establishment of his court in Babylon (7.5.72 ff.). He announces to a select audience, comprising the peers and men of influence and worth in his army, that he expects them to spend their days in the public buildings, just as the peers do in Persia, "ὥσπερ ἐν Πέρσῃ" (7.5.85). Moreover, he also decides that the future sons of his audience will be educated in Babylon in accordance with Persian customs, and calls on his men to set good examples to their children (*ibid.*).

Despite his attempts to preserve elements of Persian life and education in the

comparatively alien surroundings of Babylon, Cyrus' own sons are unable to follow his example and the unity of the Persian court is destroyed by their rivalry (8.8.1 ff.). The reasons for their failure to adhere to their father's teachings are not elucidated by Xenophon (see Appendix C for a detailed discussion of Cyrus' didactic role in the *Cyropaedia*); but the subsequent decline of all the Persians is attributed to the bad example set by Cyrus' sons, rather than the Persian *paideia* maintained by Cyrus, as Xenophon believes that the characters of subjects are determined by their rulers' characters,

ὅποιοί τινες γὰρ ἂν οἱ προστάται ὦσι, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ὑπ' αὐτοῦς ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ γίγνονται. *Cyr.* 8.8.5

It is Cyrus' unique *epistēmē* and awe-inspiring example which enables him to gain his empire and secure the obedience of his subjects (1.1.5), but once he dies the empire rapidly decays.

1. Περσείδων ... οἱ δὲ Περσεῖδαι ἀπὸ Περσέως κληῖζονται: Xenophon makes no mention of the Achaemenidae, the Persian royal family which claimed descent from the legendary founding father of the Persian people Achaemenes. Herodotus, however, states that the Perseid kings are drawn from the Achaemenidae clan (Hdt. 1.125). This judgment finds support in Near Eastern sources, namely the 'Cyrus cylinder' and Darius' inscription at Behistun (see Cook 1983, 8-10). The links between the Persians and the Greek hero Perseus appear in Aeschylus in the *Persae* (*Pers.* 79-80) and in Herodotus (Hdt. 6.53), who says that the Persians maintained that Perseus was of Assyrian nationality. In keeping with this belief Xerxes sends an ambassador to ask for Argive neutrality in the impending Persian Wars, on the basis that the Persians were descended from Perses, son of Perseus and Andromeda. Xenophon, however, is more concerned with establishing the divine origin of Cyrus' family to which the Mede Artabazus (4.1.24) and Croesus allude later (see Synopsis to chapter 1), which gives Cyrus the importance and status which belies the apparent insignificance of the Persians at the beginning of the *Cyropaedia*. The use of the poetic word "κληῖζονται:", which is found in encomiastic works (e.g. Pi. *O.* 1.110) and is rarely found in Attic prose (Holden 1887, 99), is appropriate for a passage in which Cyrus' birth, physical beauty and wisdom will be praised.

φῦναι δὲ ὁ Κῦρος λέγεται καὶ ἄδεται ... ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων: Xenophon turns his attention from Cyrus' *genea* to his *physis*. The reference to the stories and songs of the barbarians is repeated later in the narrative (1.4.25 - see Introduction D (i) for a discussion of the validity of this and other references to Persian sources).

εἶδος ... κάλλιστος: Cyrus' physical beauty as both a child and man, and his attractiveness to both man and woman, is attested to by the physical admiration of the Mede, Artabazus (1.4.27 - see Appendix B), and the expectation of the Armenian prince, Tigranes, that his wife will think that Cyrus is handsome (3.1.41). Cyrus later adopts the Median practice of using cosmetics to enhance his looks and to 'cast a spell over his subjects' (8.1.40-41); his impressive physical appearance in the victory procession at

Babylon is cited as one of the possible reasons why the Persians prostrated themselves before him for the first time (8.3.14).

φιλανθρωπότατος: Cyrus learns to achieve his ends by acting as a benefactor, first to Median friends, then his army, then his allies and finally to the various peoples of his army (see Due 1989, 163 ff. for a discussion of Cyrus as a philanthropic leader in the *Cyropaedia*).

φιλομαθέστατος καὶ φιλοτιμότατος ... ἐπαινεῖσθαι: Cyrus' desire to learn everything, from friend or foe, and to use it to his advantage, singles him out even at an early age as a natural leader (see Synopsis to chapter 3 for a discussion of Cyrus' *philomathia* and Synopsis to chapter 4 for a discussion of *philotimia*), and he uses his ambition and love of praise to inspire his peers before their expedition to Media (see 1.5.12; see also Due 1989, 181 ff. for a discussion of Cyrus' *philotimia* and *philomathia*).

2. ἐπαιδεύθη γε μὴν ἐν Περσῶν νόμοις: Cyrus is educated alongside the other Persians (cf. Cyrus the Younger in the *Anabasis* - see Synopsis). He also has the benefit of his father's advice on his religious and military duties as leader of the Persian expedition to Media (see Synopsis to chapter 6 and Appendix C), but is expected to undergo the full course of Persian *paideia* as well (1.5.1). Plutarch, in his life of Agesilaus, notes that heirs to the Spartan throne were exempted from undergoing the public education of Sparta (Plu. *Ages.* 1.1). Agesilaus differed from other kings because he had been brought up in the expectation of remaining a private citizen, and had undergone the *agogē*. He was therefore educated to obey others and was consequently more in harmony with his subjects than any of the other kings. The education of the heir to the throne in Xenophon's description of Persian *nomoi* bears a strong resemblance to other Greek accounts of Persian customs (see Synopsis). In the *Oeconomicus* Ischomachus comments how he teaches his servants justice by applying maxims from the laws of Dracon and Solon, and from the legal code, *basilikoi nomoi*, of the Persian king (*Oec.* 14.6). Praise of Persian institutions also occurs in Aeschylus' *Persae* when the Persian

chorus reflect on how under Darius' rule their customs, *nomismata*, were like towers of strength (*Pers.* 859-860).

οὔτοι δὲ δοκοῦσιν ... : Xenophon uses the present tense throughout the rest of the chapter to demonstrate that the educational system he is describing still exists in Persia.

κοινοῦ ἀγαθοῦ: Xenophon refers to the ideal of the 'common good', the stabilising force in Persian society. Both Cyrus' parents, Mandane and Cambyses, define this ideal of king and state working in harmony for Cyrus (1.3.18 & 8.5.24-25); Cyrus, however, redefines what his subjects understand as the common good to the extent that he as their king becomes the sole guarantor of stability and prosperity during his reign (8.1.45).

ἐν ταῖς πλείσταις πόλεσιν: 'In the majority of [Greek] states'. Xenophon has Athens particularly in mind when addressing these remarks (see Synopsis).

προσάττουσιν ... μὴ κλέπτειν ... : A series of prohibitions in Persian society are listed, which are equally relevant to Greek society. Xenophon is commenting on the absurdity of not educating everyone for the common good of society. He implies that the majority of Greek states lack a set of guiding principles which ensure that the young are educated with common goals in mind.

3. οἱ πολῖται: Xenophon gives a deliberately Greek colour to his version of Persian society, by deliberately using Greek terminology to make the world he is describing appear less alien to his readership. He can speak of a Persian *polis* inhabited by *politai*, who live and work around a special *agora* in their city thus making the Persians dwell in a place whose layout is not unfamiliar to Greek city state dwellers. The Persian concept of citizenship is, however, based on a different premise from that of most Greek *poleis*, as it is not merely dependent on birth but also on undergoing the *paideusis* of the state (1.2.15). He does not specify exactly when the Persians became fully-fledged citizens; presumably the passage from the class of youths to the adult men - in the way

that the completion of the Athenian *ephebeia* (see Synopsis) led to full Athenian citizenship - would have been an appropriate point to confer some form of citizenship.

The city of the Persians itself is not named, and in a passage dealing with Persian society in general he may possibly be referring to an archetypal Persian city. However, this city houses a royal palace and places of government, “τὰ βασιλεια καὶ τὰλλα ἀρχεῖα”. Xenophon presumably is referring specifically to Pasargadae, the ancient capital of the Persians, later reputed to house the tomb of Cyrus (see Cook 1983, 34-36). Susa, the former Elamite capital, and the place where one of Cyrus’ successors, Darius I, built his palace, is the home of Panthea and Abradatas in the *Cyropaedia* (e.g. 4.6.11 & 5.1.3). When Cyrus returns as a conquering hero to meet his parents (8.5.21), he goes back “εἰς τὴν πόλιν”, to an unspecified city which clearly must be the same city. Cyrus later, as emperor of Persia, uses three different royal palaces each year, none of which is in Persia (8.6.22 - see Appendix C). He does return to the royal palace in Persia for the seventh time in his reign as a prelude to his death (8.7.1).

The question then is why Xenophon does not name the capital city at this point, or indeed give any indication that he knows of the existence of the place? The studious avoidance of mentioning Pasargadae gives the world of the Persians a curious kind of dislocation and lack of focus, in comparison with Xenophon’s later account of Cyrus’ concentration on Babylon as the centre of his new empire. The importance of the Persian capital is thus diminished in comparison with Babylon. In similar fashion the city of Astyages’ court in Media, Ecbatana, is only mentioned once at the end of the work (8.6.22), and not when Cyrus stays there as a boy.

Ἐλευθέρα Ἀγορά: The Persian abhorrence of the business of buying and selling is revealed by Herodotus in one of his anecdotes about Cyrus (Hdt. 1.153 - see 1.6.32). Cyrus is expressing a general prejudice against the Greeks for having markets for buying and selling - a practice which the Persians avoid so studiously that they do not even have a single market-place in their whole country (Hdt. *ibid.*, which is corroborated in Strabo’s *Geographica* Str. 15.3.19), even though Herodotus informs us earlier (Hdt. 1.135) that they readily adopt foreign practices including Greek ones (Hdt. 1.135).

Aristotle refers to the Thessalians' use of the 'free *agora*' in his *Politics* (*Pol.* 1331A), a haven of tranquillity in which all forms of commerce are banned and which he recommends as being a suitable place for magistrates and for elders to exercise.

ἀπειροκαλῖαι ἀπελήλανται ... : There is certain amount of disdain in Xenophon's description of how the market traders with their raucous vulgarities have been forced away from the administrative centre of the city. Such a situation did not exist in the Athens of Xenophon, where geography ensured that the political life of the city was closely connected to its market-place, and Xenophon may be displaying his own prejudices in echoing aristocratic dislike of merchants and trade, an occupation which was felt to be beneath the noblest and highest echelons of Athenian society. He knew, from his own military experiences, the necessity of using market traders to supply an army with provisions, and Cyrus himself is shown tolerating them on his own expeditions (4.5.42). When Herodotus tells us that the Persians regarded their third mighty emperor Darius as being a *kapēlos*, a huckster who is motivated by profit (Hdt. 3.88 - see Introduction D (v)) - an impression he has already created by recounting the tale of Darius' pillaging of the tomb of Queen Nitocris of Babylon (Hdt. 1.188) - their denigration of his name becomes even more apparent especially when compared with their reverence of their 'father' Cyrus.

μυγνύηται ἡ ... τύρβη: The noise of the 'rabble of the market square' is seen as disordering the well regulated lives of those undergoing education. The Persian solution to potential problems of crime among their citizens is to remove temptation for them, right from the beginning, to the extent of excluding what are deemed the undesirable elements in society from the royal palace and government buildings. The desire to protect the moral purity of those undergoing the Persian *paideia* is thus reflected in the architecture and organization of the city.

τῇ τῶν πεπαιδευμένων εὐκοσμίᾳ: Xenophon underlines the contrast between the disorder beyond the 'free square' and the strictly regimented life which takes place within it

(Jaeger 1945, III, 164). Such a life is the preserve of what Xenophon terms the 'educated', and the educational system he is about to describe only applies to this privileged minority (cf. *An.* 1.9.3-4 where Cyrus the Younger is brought up in an atmosphere where nothing base, *aischron*, can be seen or heard).

4. ἡ ἀγορὰ ... τέτταρα μέρη: The free square of the Persians is designed in accordance with the needs of the Persian *paideia*, and reflects the four divisions of male society. Control over the boys, youths and men is maintained by their having to report daily to their respective quarters, or, if they are old enough to be married, on a regular basis. Cyrus proposes to have the same arrangement in his capital at Babylon (7.5.85).

5. δώδεκα ... Περσῶν φυλαί: Herodotus is less precise on the matter of Persian tribes, saying that there are a number of them and giving the names of ten of them, of which the leading ones are the Pasargadae, Maraphii and Maspai (Hdt. 1.125 - see Frye 1976, 90 & Cook 1983, 39-40 on the Herodotean Persian tribes). The tribal divisions of Persian society are adhered to throughout the Persian *paideia* (1.2.12), but when Cyrus reorganises this army to fight the Assyrians in Book 2, there is no mention of his preserving traditional tribal divisions in the ranks of his army (see Synopsis to chapter 6 on Cyrus' efforts to supplant the existing tribal and ancestral ties amongst the Persians). He does divide his army into twelve parts during the siege of Babylon (7.5.13), but does so in order that each part would be responsible for sentry duty at the siege-works for one month of the year.

ὑπὸ τῆς μεγίστης ἀρχῆς: The 'highest authority'. Presumably this refers to the Council of Elders who act in concert with the King, and the leaders of the elders referred to in the same passage as the *prostatai* who hold the highest offices in the land, "τὰς ἀρχὰς οἵπερ τῶν μεγίστων κύριοί εἰσι" (8.5.22 - cf. 1.5.5 where the elders exercise their authority to choose Cyrus to lead an expeditionary force to support the Medes).

βέλτιστοι ... πολῖται: Cf. Cambyses' remark to Cyrus that the Persians have taken care

to ensure their educational system produces more civilised and law abiding citizens (1.6.33).

6. μανθάνοντες δικαιοσύνην ... ὥσπερ παρ' ἡμῖν ... γράμματα μαθησόμενοι: The learning of reading and writing defines schooling in Greece, the Persian schools are defined solely by the learning of justice, whereas the Persian schools are later referred to as “τὰ κοινὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης διδασκαλεῖα” (1.2.15). Although there is no mention of the Persians being taught *grammata*, a certain level of literacy is assumed for the educated Persians; Cyrus is later shown sending a letter to Astyages (4.5.26 ff.). Xenophon clearly demonstrates that the Persians regard the learning of justice as the priority for boys, who will occupy the top positions in the armies and administration of their people. A litigious atmosphere is encouraged in these schools to enable them to learn, playground transgressions and arguments are settled by one of the boys presiding over them under the watchful eye of the teacher. Xenophon provides an illustration of this quasi-judicial process in action when Cyrus' mother tries to persuade him not to prolong his stay in Media (1.3.16 ff.). In answer to Mandane's question as to how he will learn justice at his grandfather's court, he tells his mother that he is already knowledgeable of justice and speaks of the occasion he gave the wrong judgement in a particular case and was punished for his error by his teacher. Xenophon's interest in the existence of judicial processes in domestic situations is displayed in the *Oeconomicus*, when he depicts Ischomachus cross-examining the conduct of his slaves, and endowing his wife with judicial powers within the confines of the *oikos*, having taught her to reason, διαλέγεσθαι, with him (*Oec.* 11.23-25 - see Pomeroy 1994, 313).

τιμωροῦνται: The punishments handed in the Persian *paideia* are invariably severe. Cyrus reveals later that he was flogged for deciding incorrectly in a case (1.3.16), and whenever he displayed any intentions to deceive someone (1.6.29); his mother gives him a hyperbolic warning that if he returns home from Media with notions of supporting tyranny he runs the risk of being whipped to death (1.3.18). Severe punishments are particularly associated with Spartan education (*Lac.* 2.2).

7. ἀχαριστίας: The idea of common bonding amongst the pupils is pursued at all costs, so the idea of anyone taking more than their own share or taking advantage of another is particularly frowned upon. Xenophon's depiction of ingratitude as the root of crime and moral degeneracy, *anaischuntia*, is reminiscent of Isocrates' and Plato's belief in honourable shame, *aidos*, acting as positive force in education and the control of Greek society (Jaeger 1945, III, 164). In the *Agesilaus* Xenophon depicts the Spartan king as being renowned for his gratitude and his willingness to repay a debt (*Ages.* 4.1 ff.); the same quality is also attributed to Cyrus the Younger (*An.* 1.9.11-12).

περὶ θεοῦς ... γονέας καὶ πατρίδα καὶ φίλους: The four main areas of duty for the Persian citizens are listed in descending order of importance. There is significantly no mention of duty to the Persian king. The Persian *politeia* treats him as inseparable from the *polis* itself. When Cyrus establishes his empire and is regarded by all his subjects as a father figure, whose affections they compete for (8.1.44 & 8.2.28), the notions of duty towards one's parents, fatherland and friends are consequently modified to incorporate love for him as ruler of their empire.

8. σωφροσύνην: On the range of meanings conveyed by the term and its use by Xenophon in the *Cyropaedia* see North 1966, 123 ff. *Sōphrosynē* in the *Cyropaedia* "has a wider scope than *enkrateia*, which is usually restricted to the control of appetites and passions" (North *ibid.*, 130), and refers to mental as well as physical self-control. Due notes that this term is not particularly characteristic of fourth century literature (Due 1989, 170). In the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus lays great stress on the importance of *sōphrosynē* (e.g. 6.1.47 & 8.1.30). The importance and meaning of this moral value is later discussed in Cyrus' debate with the Armenian prince, Tigranes (3.1.16 ff. - see Gera 1993, 95-96). In the *Anabasis* Cyrus the Younger is depicted as learning this quality in his education (*An.* 1.9.3 - see Synopsis). *Sōphrosynē* also appears in a Persian context in Aeschylus' *Persae* when the ghost of Darius observes that Xerxes has learnt this quality through being punished by the gods for his *hybris* in attacking Greece (*Pers.* 829-831 - see North 1966, 34-35).

πείθεσθαι τοῖς ἄρχουσι: The importance of learning obedience before one can learn to command is mentioned by Cyrus as being part of his education. He regards the majority of the Persian *nomoi* as tending towards teaching how to govern and be governed, “ἀρχεῖν τε καὶ ἄρχεσθαι” (see 1.6.20). The same point is made about Persian education in the *Anabasis* (*An.* 1.9.4).

ἐγκρατεῖς εἶναι γαστρὸς καὶ ποτοῦ: On the importance of *enkrateia*, physical self-control, which is closely linked to *sōphrosynē* (see above). Due lists the several occurrences of *enkrateia* in the narrative and demonstrates that it is one of the ways a man can achieve *aretē* (Due 1989, 170-181).

οὐ παρὰ μητρὶ σιτοῦνται: Xenophon’s depiction of Persian boys eating with their teachers, and not with their mothers, has parallels in his account of public dining in Sparta (*Lac.* 5.2 ff.). Lycurgus recognises that eating with elders can have an educational effect on the young and deliberately encouraged a wide range of ages to dine with each other (*Lac.* 5.5). In the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus encourages communal eating and makes officers to eat with the men of their company (2.1.28), in order to strengthen the comradeship within the army. The role of the family in the Persian *paideia* is further limited by the decree that boys can only stay the night with their families until the age of sixteen or seventeen, when, as *ephēboi*, they spend the night guarding the government buildings. There is no mention here of the role of women in the upbringing of children. Xenophon assumes that women have very little influence in the Persian *paideia*. The lack of closeness to the family is reflected in Cyrus’ own behaviour towards his parents. He is perfectly happy to stay in Media for as long as possible, and talks his mother into leaving him at his grandfather’s court by telling her an anecdote of his education of which she seemingly has no knowledge (1.3.17). Cyrus’ conversation with Cambyses in chapter 6 of Book 1 is also notable for its lack of intimacy between father and son (see Synopsis to chapter 6 and Appendix C).

κάρδαμον: Xenophon is referring here to some kind of cress, either water cress or more

probably common garden cress, *Lepidium sativum*, (*LSJ* s.v.), which is native to the Near East. The leaf or seed of this cress, which has a bitter taste, was bruised and eaten as relish by the Persians (see 1.2.11 & Str. 15.3.18). Cicero equates the plant Xenophon mentions here in the *Cyropaedia* with a plant he refers to as the ‘nasturtium’ (Cic. *De Fin.* 2.92).

9. δοκεῖ γὰρ αὕτη ἡ ἡλικία μάλιστα ἐπιμελείας δεῖσθαι: The care with which impressionable youths must be educated is also dealt with in the *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia* (*Lac.* 3.2). The Spartan *paideia* recognises this period of life as being one where the youth is liable to act according to his own will, display *hybris*, and seek pleasure, and therefore devises a constant round of duties for youths to keep them occupied at all times. The same idea is also expressed at this point in the *Cyropaedia*; the Persian youths are kept busy hunting and on guard duty. Cambyses later reveals that it is not until Persian youths reach manhood that they are deemed to be ready to be taught the arts of deception in warfare (1.6.33-34).

ἐπὶ θήραν: The educational qualities of hunting are described by Xenophon in the *Cynegeticus* (e.g. *Cyn.* 1.18 & 12.1 ff.), and his praise of the sport as an excellent preparation for warfare and life in general is also reflected in his attitude toward its beneficial effects on the Persian youth in the *Cyropaedia*. Cambyses and Cyrus discuss the benefits of hunting as a preparation for using stratagems in warfare in chapter 6 of Book 1 (1.6.28 ff.). Cyrus’ stratagem to subdue the Armenian king is accordingly likened to hunting a hare (2.4.19 & 2.4.25 ff.). His love of hunting is developed during his stay in Media (1.4.5 ff.) and remains with him even in his later years when he takes every available opportunity to hunt with his friends in the *paradeisoi* in Babylon (8.1.38). Cyrus does his hunting in Media on horseback, just as Cyrus the Younger who is described as a lover of hunting, “φιλοθηρότατος”, revels in the opportunity to use his skills as a horseman in the chase (*An.* 1.9.6). In Xenophon’s description of the Persian education system in the *Cyropaedia* there is no mention of hunting serving as training in riding horses. Horsemanship, and its attendant application in cavalry warfare, is the

one military skill lacking in Xenophon's Persians. The mountainous nature of the Persian terrain is unsuitable for horse-breeding and by implication for hunting on horseback. When Cambyzes discusses with his son the hunting the latter has done as part of his *paideia* (1.6.28), he makes no mention of horses and speaks of Cyrus using methods associated with hunting on foot, namely using nets, snares and hidden pits, all of which are described in Xenophon's treatise on Greek hunting the *Cynegeticus*. Similarly, when Cyrus unveils his stratagem to hunt down the rebel Armenian king (2.4.22 ff.), he envisages flushing out the king from the cover of the mountains on foot, and his operations against the warlike Chaldaeans (3.2.1 ff.) are all conducted on foot.

τόξα ... κοπίδα ἢ σάγαριν: The youths not yet entrusted with heavy weapons which the adult men bear - the sword and shield - as they are not regarded as being ready for training in close quarter warfare, which the adult men will learn. They are provided instead with a bow and arrows, lightweight spears and a κοπίς and a σάγαρις for hunting. The κοπίς is a term used for a variety of cutting instruments, from a knife (Eur. *El.* 837) to a billhook, the instrument which Herodotus' Cyrus asks the Persians to appear with as a prelude to his revolt from Median rule (Hdt. 1.125 - see Introduction D (v)). Xenophon displays a characteristic desire for precision and his own knowledge of military matters by also giving another term for the weapon with the curved blade used by Near Eastern cavalry, the σάγαρις being associated with the Scythians (Hdt. 1.215 & 7.64) and the Amazons and Mossynoecians by Xenophon (*An.* 4.4.16 & 5.4.13).

10. βασιλεὺς ... ἐν πολέμῳ ἡγεμὼν ... : As in Sparta, the king is the leader in war (*Lac.* 13.1 ff.). This role also involves him taking part in religious rituals and sacrifice, which are discussed by Cambyzes and Cyrus in chapter 6 (1.6.2 ff.). The importance of hunting is such that it is provided for out of public funds. Xenophon shows his knowledge of the Near East in stressing the central role of hunting in Persian society, where the king organises and takes part in the hunt.

τῶν ἀλκίμων θηρίων ... : Xenophon foreshadows here the young Cyrus' brush with

danger in hunting wild boar in Media (see 1.4.8).

11. ἄριστον: 'The midday meal'. The frugal nature of the youths' rations is part of the educational process (cf. *Lac.* 2.5-6). Eating is regarded as secondary to pursuit in the hunt, as the peer Hystaspas later remarks when the Persians prepare to pursue the routed Assyrian army (4.2.46). Persian youths are expected to undergo privations as a toughening process for war, and any beasts killed are extra food to be enjoyed. There is no mention of any concern about the nutrition of the young men. Xenophon seems to assume that they are adequately fed and that there is sufficient opportunity in their regular hunting trips for the young men to improve their diet. When Cyrus takes his own army into Media his father lectures him on obtaining good provisions for his troops; moreover, they must have them regularly and in sufficient quantities (1.6.9 ff.).

εἰ δέ τις αὐτοὺς οἶται ἢ ἐσθίειν ἀηδῶς: 'If anyone thinks that they eat without pleasure ...'. The Assyrian Gobryas initially believes that the Persians are less generous than his own people on observing the simplicity of their diet (5.2.16); however, he soon realises that a frugal diet is one of the cornerstones of the Persians' virtuous and abstemious lifestyle. Throughout the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus is portrayed as espousing the benefits of simple eating (e.g. 1.3.4 & 4.2.38 ff.), and one of the outward signs of the later Persians' degeneracy is their love of exotic foods which have they have learnt from the Medes (8.8.15-16). In the same vein the character of Agesilaus is contrasted favourably with the Persian king for his ability to eat whatever food was available whereas the Persian king employed hundreds of cooks to satisfy his demand for new dishes (*Ages.* 9.3-4).

12. δημόσιοι ... ἀγῶνες καὶ ἄθλα: The institution of athletic contests among the youths to which Xenophon refers is a fundamental part of Spartan education, and regarded as a means of teaching manly virtues, *andragathia* (*Lac.* 4.1-2). Their importance in Greek literature dates back to the Homeric epics (*Il.* 23.257 ff., *Od.* 8.100 ff.) and Xenophon includes them in the *Cyropaedia* (see Introduction D (ii)). The educational effects of a spirit of healthy rivalry engendered by such contests and the offering of prizes as

rewards, are so great that they are employed by Cyrus in his training of his army (1.6.18 & 2.1.22 ff.). During the organisation of his empire after the conquest in Babylon, he institutes public contests; he uses them not only to encourage his followers to strive after *aretē* but also in order to create a spirit of rivalry amongst his own nobles to keep his own position secure (8.2.26 - see Gera 1993, 294).

13. ὅσα φρονούντων ... ἔργα ... καὶ ἐτι δυναμένων: The initial results of the Persian *paideia* become apparent once the youths enter the class of adult men. As adults they are now supposed to be qualified to carry out tasks which require *phronēsis*, good sense and practical wisdom, and *dynamis*, physical strength and endurance.

τὰ δ' ἀγχέμαχα ὄπλα καλούμενα: Xenophon's description of the Persian men abandoning their bows and arrows and spears for weapons of 'close contact', shows that they are trained to make the transition from martial training through hunting to being prepared for warfare. They therefore no longer need the weapons suitable for the chase (1.2.9), but require more efficient weapons for close quarter fighting. It is important to remember that these weapons are the preserve of the educated élite who control the army. The uneducated poorer Persians make up the rest of the army as lightly armed troops serving as archers and spearmen. Cyrus determines to rectify this imbalance in weaponry, between the educated peers and the common soldiery, when he plans his campaign against the Assyrians (2.1.10-11 - see Synopsis to chapter 5). His concern is that the majority of his troops will be overwhelmed by the superior numbers of the enemy unless they are given the opportunity to engage in close quarter fighting with the same weaponry as the peers.

οἷόνπερ γράφονται οἱ Πέρσαι: Xenophon makes use of visual evidence to authenticate his description of the Persians, in an isolated reference to depictions of Persians in Greek art. Whereas his readership would not have been so able to corroborate his references to tales and songs of the Persians, they would have had the chance to see representations of Persians in sculpture. Bizos notes that Xenophon could have been inspired by the

depiction of Persians from the battle of Marathon on the *Stoa Poikile* in Athens (the paintings are mentioned by Pausanias in his description of Attica (Paus. 1.15)) and by their depiction in art, where Persian and Median soldiers are given the small round shield and sabre described in this section by Xenophon (Bizos 1971, I, 96).

14. Οἱ δ' ... γεραίτεροι: Finally, Xenophon deals with the elders. He implies that they are still available for military service but not outside their own country. The elders occupy a role in Persian society akin to the role of the Spartan *Gerousia* as the supreme judicial authority, who judge trials involving capital offences (cf. *Lac.* 10.1 ff.). The elders also act as a kind of check on the activities of the younger men in that they have the power to expel them from the privileged ranks of the educated for life, where they remain *atimoi*, permanently without honour in society.

οἱ φύλαρχοι: This is a reference to the twelve tribal leaders of each division who are mentioned earlier (see 1.2.5).

15. σαφέστερον δηλωθῆ: Xenophon's emphasis is always on clarity of narrative, and in sections such as these, which are devoted wholly to expounding a succession of details, his prose style is deliberately concise.

λέγονται ... Πέρσαι ... ἀμφὶ τὰς δώδεκα μυριάδας εἶναι: Bizos notes that this figure should not be taken seriously, believing that the figure of 120,000 for the Persian population is far inferior to what it would have been in historical reality (Bizos 1971, I, 96). The question to be posed is whether Xenophon is referring here to the whole of the Persian society, or only to part of it? In view of the absence of any comments on the role of women in the *politeia* it can be assumed that his figure refers only to male Persians. In the immediate context of this passage, where he says that the schools of justice were open to all boys, it could be argued that the figure applies to all adult Persian males (see 1.2.3 on a suggestion of when Persian citizenship was conferred). However, Xenophon goes on to reveal that the *paideia* that he has just described is limited only to the élite

who successfully complete the prescribed stages of their education (see below). The army that Cyrus raises, which is regarded as being small (1.1.4), consists of 30,000 *dēmotai* and 1,000 men selected from the ranks of the peers (1.5.5). If the total number of the Persian male population was 120,000 Cyrus would have been taking a quarter of it away with him to fight the Assyrians, which would have been extremely unlikely. Hence the figure must apply to only those Persians who have completed all or certain stages of their *paideia*, hence the comparatively small number cited (see Tuplin 1990, 18 ff. for a useful discussion of this population figure and its fictional nature, noting that the number 120,000 may simply represent the twelve tribes he has mentioned earlier).

τὰ κοινὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης διδασκαλεῖα: The implication here is that the numbers of boys entering the state schools of justice is high, but the numbers fall as the costs of supporting the boys through the lengthy educational process are realised. Xenophon goes on to indicate that even partial attendance at the Persian *paideia* is not sufficient to become a citizen - completion of all the classes is the only way to ensure membership of the elders and the rights and privileges enjoyed by this class. The Persian educational system is thus largely based on the financial means of the pupils' families rather than the individual merits of the pupils, which has led to the creation of an educated, self-perpetuating aristocracy. The *dēmotai* are accordingly unable to be properly educated owing to their poverty. The case of Pheraulas the commoner who wins Cyrus' favour and is accordingly rewarded is no doubt meant to be typical. Pheraulas tells his friend the Sacian that his father had been able to send him to state school of justice and enable him to have the education of the boys; unfortunately his father was not rich enough to support him beyond this stage and Pheraulas had to return to work on the farm (8.3.37). Thus men of talent and courage such as Pheraulas are left by the wayside due to lack of financial resources rather than their ability.

16. τοῦ ἐκπονεῖσθαι τὴν δίαιταν ... τὸ ἀποπτύειν ... : Xenophon produces proof of the Persians' dedication to abstemious living by citing their dedication to working off by exercise what they eat, their avoidance of openly performing bodily functions, their

preference for sweating the moisture out of their bodies (cf. Herodotus' remark that the Persian customs do not allow them to vomit or to urinate in another's presence (Hdt. 1.133)). Cyrus later tells his father that he never overeats and that he exercises after eating (1.6.17). He later ensures that the soldiers in his army are never allowed to sit down to a meal without having broken sweat through exercise (2.1.29). In the final chapter of the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon comments that the Persians of his day still observe the custom of refraining from spitting or blowing their noses, but their laziness is such that they no longer try to work off moisture through exercise (8.8.8).

τὰς Κύρου πράξεις: Xenophon announces that he has arrived at the real subject of the *Cyropaedia*. The discussion of the Persian *paideia* has been a digression, designed to provide a backdrop to Cyrus' own life and his words and deeds.

Chapter 3

Synopsis

Xenophon now deals in great detail with Cyrus' stay in Media; an episode which proves to be crucial in the development of Cyrus as a future leader, and which is deliberately juxtaposed with the cursory account of the Persian way of life. For approximately four years Cyrus is free from the rigours of the Persian *paideia* and from the only two figures of authority who are depicted as exerting their control over him in the *Cyropaedia*, the anonymous Persian teacher (1.3.16-17) and his father, Cambyses. During his adolescence in Media, which is the most important age in education (1.2.9), when the mind is at its most impressionable, he is left unchecked and free to educate himself. The influence of Media is therefore particularly important on the development of Cyrus throughout the work and on the style of leadership he eventually adopts in Babylon.¹ In depicting Cyrus' lengthy stay in Media and his affinity with life in his grandfather's court, Xenophon alludes to the close historical links between the Medes and Persians. Strabo in his *Geographica* regards the Medes as having provided the Persians with many of their institutions (Str. 11.13.9).² There is also a Median element in Cyrus' education in Herodotus' and Ctesias' accounts of Cyrus' life, whereby Cyrus gains experience of the Median court but in entirely different circumstances. Herodotus depicts Cyrus being summoned to the Median court as a ten-year-old boy with his foster-parent, the cowherd Mitradataes, in order to be punished by Astyages for whipping the son of a Persian noble (Hdt. 1.115 ff.). In Ctesias' account which is preserved by Nicolaus of Damascus, he is a servant of Astyages who works his way up to the position of cupbearer (*FGrH* 90 F 66).³ Xenophon, however, shows Cyrus' arriving at the Median court in far more auspicious circumstances as the Persian prince who is invited by his grandfather to Media on account of his already burgeoning reputation.

¹ See Gera 1993, 290 ff.

² See also Cook 1983, 41 & Frye 1976, 102.

³ See Due 1989, 137 f.

Chapter 3 marks the beginning of the main narrative of the *Cyropaedia*, where Xenophon introduces the characters of Cyrus, Astyages and Mandane in a lively dramatic fashion, using dialogue to develop and highlight the attitudes of the protagonists. Xenophon shows a keen appreciation of the feelings and behaviour of a boy suddenly placed in alien surroundings, yet who refuses to be disconcerted by their strangeness. His portrayal of the young Cyrus is a remarkable and vivid portrait of childhood. In its depth of characterisation it has few parallels in either previous or later Greek literature (See Introduction D (ii)). Xenophon's Persian prince is by turns, impetuous, jealous, cunning and affectionate, gregarious and bashful as he adapts to life in Media (cf. the youthful authority and self-possession of Cyrus in Herodotus' account of his life (Hdt. 1.114-115)).⁴ Another Herodotean example of the self-confidence of a young Persian prince, which astonishes those around him, appears in Book 3 of his work. Cyrus' son Cambyses, at the tender age of ten, vows to avenge the dishonour his mother felt in being supplanted in her husband's affections by an Egyptian princess, by claiming that when he is a man he will 'turn all Egypt upside down' (Hdt. 3.3).

After the worthy but rather prosaic content of the previous two chapters, the more dramatic tone and content of the work is a sudden and welcome change; Xenophon gives his Greek audience an impression of an archetypal barbarian royal court in his description of the customs of Astyages' court. He depicts a world which is very far removed from the Persian *politeia* he has just outlined in chapter two, and whose salient characteristics of luxury and hedonism would have appealed to the traditional Greek tendency to moralise about the excesses of oriental despots and kings (see Introduction C). Cyrus is introduced to this world after being educated in Persia until the age of twelve; he and his mother, Mandane, are sent for by Astyages, who is curious to see the young *kalos kagathos* of whom he has so heard so much (1.3.1). On arrival at the Median court Cyrus immediately strives to make a good impression in Media with a display of affection towards his grandfather. His attention is immediately drawn to the cosmetics Astyages wears, a visible sign of the ostentation and grandeur of the Median

⁴ See Gera 1993, 155.

court (1.3.2). When his mother Mandane teases him by asking him to decide who is the more handsome, his father or grandfather, Cyrus neatly sidesteps the question by replying that both men are the most handsome in their respective kingdoms. Astyages rewards him with gifts of clothes and makes the boy his constant companion; above all, he gives Cyrus the opportunity to learn horsemanship (1.3.3).

Cyrus is also allowed to dine with his grandfather, although Astyages' attempts to please him with dainty Median dishes are met initially with a lecture on the virtues of Persian frugality by Cyrus (1.3.4). Even Astyages' table manners do not escape critical scrutiny from the Persian prince (1.3.5). Astyages chooses not to persist with this line of conversation even though he could have explained the purpose behind using a napkin when dealing with food eaten with sauces; he bows instead to Cyrus' argument and gives the boy the simple bread and meat he desires, thus setting the precedent for giving in to his grandson's wishes (1.3.6). When he receives a very large portion of meat, which he perceives to be a sign of Median extravagance, Cyrus sees an opportunity to ingratiate himself in the Median court. He distributes portions of the meat to all of Astyages' servants in turn as a reward for good service and good behaviour (1.3.7). However, one member of Astyages' retinue, who happens to be his favourite - the Sacian cupbearer - is excluded from this mock display of patronage. The Median king wonders why the Sacian has not been rewarded for performing his duties when he does them in such an elegant manner (1.3.8). Cyrus' response is to mimic the cupbearer's duties in pouring a goblet of wine, much to the amusement of everyone, although he does not taste the wine before offering it to his grandfather (1.3.9). Astyages then asks why he has omitted the last, and most important duty of the cupbearer, namely sampling the wine to test for poison (1.3.10). Once again Cyrus lectures him, this time on the impropriety of his drunken behaviour and that of his companions at a celebration of his birthday, who in their intoxication did not treat or speak to Astyages as they should do to a king. Astyages ignores the issue of his companions' behaviour to ask whether Cambyses ever gets drunk (1.3.11), thus displaying a complete lack of knowledge and comprehension about Persia and Persian customs (see Introduction C). Mandane fears that Astyages' teasing may lead Cyrus into eventually saying something rash, and that

Astyages may become irritated by being continually compared unfavourably with the Persian king, so she intervenes to ensure the conversation remains on the subject of the hapless Sacian cupbearer. Cyrus has no hesitation in robustly defending his own father's sensible attitude towards wine and requests permission to rule over the Sacian cupbearer for three days.

Although he is outspoken in his criticism of Median hedonism, Cyrus endears himself to his grandfather and uncle by attending to their every need, and when Mandane prepares to return to Persia, Astyages asks her to let Cyrus stay with him (1.3.12-13). Mandane leaves the decision to Cyrus, and Astyages seeks to win him over with a number of lavish promises of the future benefits he will receive by staying in Media (1.3.14). Cyrus immediately agrees to stay, to the consternation of his mother, who wants to know his reasons for not accompanying her (1.3.15). He replies that he wishes to acquire horse-riding skills in addition to the practical skills he has learnt in Persia. When Mandane reminds him that he will miss out on his schooling in justice, Cyrus reassures her that he already knows enough about the subject, citing one particular trial in his education in which he truly learnt about the nature of *dikaiosynē* (1.3.16-17). The case used by Cyrus to show the workings of Persian justice is, as one would expect of a childhood squabble, simple. He tells his mother how once a big boy with small tunic decided to take a big tunic off a little boy. Cyrus was called on to arbitrate on the ensuing dispute and decided that whatever the wrongs of the forcible exchange, the end justified the means as both boys now had tunics which fitted them. His teacher took the opposite view and punished him accordingly. In the teacher's opinion Cyrus was wrong not to consider the act of appropriating the tunic in his final decision and was condoning the unjust behaviour of the big boy. Mandane makes one final attempt to dissuade Cyrus from staying in Media, but it too meets with a confident rebuff (1.3.18). She comments unfavourably on the despotic system of monarchy of Media which stands in contrast to the open accountable monarchy of Persia, the latter being based on the law rather than the whim of an individual. She warns Cyrus that if he returns home with new, Median, notions of power and justice he risks severe punishment. Cyrus, however, neatly avoids this issue, realising that he cannot argue against the central point of

Mandane's case, which is that he will be exposing himself to an environment where the principles of his education will be sorely tested. He argues that, just as in Persia, he will not receive any preferential treatment in his upbringing. Astyages will treat him more like a subject than a grandson, and will not groom him to expect the same privileges that the Median king receives; instead he will, like Astyages' subjects, be trained to expect to receive less rather than more.

In the course of the narrative outlined above, three main interrelated themes of the *Cyropaedia* are introduced: the physical and moral superiority of the Persians over the Medes,⁵ which justifies Cyrus' usurpation of the Median king's role and eventual annexation of Media into the Persian empire; the efforts of Cyrus to educate himself by learning from his experiences at his grandfather's court, his *philomathia*; and the concept of *pleonexia*, the idea of taking advantage of one's superiority over others to advance one's own cause. Xenophon portrays Cyrus as the embodiment of Persian superiority, who seizes the opportunity to educate himself in Media, and who is motivated by his own conception of *pleonexia* to subjugate the other peoples of the Near East, including the Medes.

Xenophon's depiction of the Medes of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* is reminiscent of his vivid portrayal of the failings of the Persians in the final chapter of the work (8.8.1 ff.). It is implied in his account of the extravagance, love of luxury and drunkenness in the Median court that their civilization was once powerful, but is now declining in the same way that the Persians of the fourth century have failed to follow the standards set by Cyrus, through their adoption of Median clothes, luxury and their favouring of the effeminacy of the Medes over the traditional Persian discipline (8.8.15). Astyages is shown to be a firm despotic leader of Media (1.3.18), but he is ageing and prone to sickness (1.4.2). His heir, Cyaxares, symbolises all the weaknesses and vices of the Median lifestyle (e.g. 4.5.7-8). He lacks any aptitude for kingship, and, according to the implication of Cyrus' speech to his father, does not deserve to rule (see 1.6.8). When Astyages dies the Medes are vulnerable to attack from the Assyrians (1.5.2), and their

⁵ See Gera 1993, 155 f. on Xenophon's regular comparisons between Medes and Persians.

vassals the Armenians refuse to pay allegiance to Cyaxares (2.4.12). The Median king is forced to enlist Persian aid to save his power in much the same way that fourth century Persians have become dependent on Greek mercenaries to fight their wars for them (8.8.26).

Xenophon's treatment of the decline of the Medes, of the inferiority of Cyaxares as an heir, and of their vulnerability to conquest, is paralleled in the *Cyropaedia* by the fate of the Assyrians. At the beginning of the work they are the mightiest power in the Near East and threaten the autonomy of Media and Persia, but their defeat at the hands of Cyrus' army and the death of their king, who is described by Gobryas as a good man, "ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός" (4.6.2), hastens their decline. The successor to the throne is a model of depravity (e.g. 5.2.27 ff.), and it is appropriate that when their city of Babylon falls they are engaged in feasting and are unprepared for battle, many being drunk and asleep (7.5.21).

The downfall of the Assyrians and to some extent the eclipse of the Medes are ideal illustrations of the maxims expressed by Cambyses to Cyrus on the ruin of *poleis* who have lost everything through their aggression against other *poleis* and their love of wealth (see 1.6.45). The theme of the decline and fall of a ruler and his people through luxuriousness, *tryphē*, figures prominently in Herodotus' work - notably in his account of the destruction of the power of Croesus and Astyages by Cyrus, and his reference to the fall of the *polis* of Sybaris (Hdt. 5.44) which was renowned for its luxury (Hdt. 6.127) - but may possibly be traceable as far back as Homer's treatment of the collapse of the civilization of the Phaeacians in the *Odyssey*.⁶ In chapters 3 and 4 of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* the downfall of the Medes is cleverly foreshadowed by the relationship of Astyages and Cyrus, in a manner reminiscent of Herodotus' account of how Astyages refrains from punishing the boy he later discovers to be Cyrus, when he is astonished by the kingly nature of the boy in front of him and begins to suspect the boy's true origins (Hdt. 1.116).

In the *Cyropaedia* Astyages' eagerness to keep his precocious grandson by his

⁶ Howie 1989, 26; see also see De Romilly 1977, 1 ff. for a discussion of the general theme of the downfall of *poleis* in Greek literature.

side is crucial in ensuring that Cyrus does stay (1.3.14). When the latter is forced to leave, Astyages bows to the inevitable will of Cambyses with reluctance, as if he would have happily kept Cyrus in Media until he reached manhood (1.4.26). Xenophon implies that the Median king's desire for Cyrus to stay stems, not just from admiration of the boy's talents, but also from recognition of Cyrus' manifest superiority to his own son Cyaxares, which becomes apparent in the military engagement with the Assyrian hunting party (1.4.19 ff.). Xenophon does not give any clear indications of Astyages' intentions regarding his succession, but the Median king, wittingly or unwittingly, grooms his grandson for taking over his kingdom through his encouragement of Cyrus' attachment to Media and the Median way of life. When Cyrus does leave Media Astyages can confidently look forward to the day his grandson will return and aid his friends and harm his enemies (1.4.26 ff.) By indulging Cyrus at every possible opportunity (1.4.2) and by giving him the opportunity to extend his stay in Media, Astyages helps to mould the career of the man who will not only deprive the Medes of their independence, but will also become the mightiest ruler ever seen in the Near East.

Cyrus proves to be a willing recipient of Astyages' largesse. From the moment of their first affectionate encounter (1.3.2), he ingratiates himself with his grandfather.⁷ His appreciative reaction to Astyages' cosmetics and wig and his delight in wearing robes and riding a horse with a gold-studded bridle shows that he is prepared to assimilate Median customs, particularly those that relate to the external trappings of power. He is later depicted as spurning his uncle Cyaxares' offer of a Median robe to meet an embassy from the Indian king, preferring to 'adorn himself with sweat and signs of haste' (2.4.5). However, the rejection of Median finery on that occasion stems, not from Cyrus' own desire to stick to plainer Persian dress, but from his refusal to submit to Cyaxares' will on such a matter and from his concern not to alienate his own soldiers by appearing in foreign dress when he has yet to fully secure his own position by success on the battlefield. Once Cyrus has achieved that success he has no qualms in showing

⁷ Tatum 1989, 99 f.

his admiration of Median *nomoi*,⁸ making the Persian peers abandon Persian dress in favour of the more elaborate Median version for the victory procession in Babylon (8.3.1 ff.). Xenophon explains earlier that Cyrus believed that a ruler's superiority to his subjects should extend to physical appearance, even if that involves enhancing one's appearance by artificial means. Cyrus believed that a ruler should bewitch his subjects by his appearance, "ἀλλὰ καὶ καταγοητεύειν ᾧετο χρῆναι αὐτούς" (8.1.40), believing that the Median dress concealed defects in the wearer. Moreover, he is also served rich and elaborate meals worthy of a Median banquet table (8.2.4 ff.),⁹ and adopts the practice of giving expensive gifts to his subjects (8.2.7) which recalls Astyages' generosity towards him. Cyrus is thus prepared to borrow certain Median customs not only to suit his own purposes but also to enrich the culture of the Persian nobility. As a product of the marriage between a Persian king and a Median princess, who has deep knowledge of the customs of both peoples, he is ideally placed to take over control of Media and achieve a synthesis of Median notions of absolute kingship with Persian values of self-control and justice in his empire.

The Persian prince's love of Median finery underlines the austere nature of his own upbringing, but does not extend to what he perceives as a lack of *sōphrosynē* and *enkrateia* amongst the Medes. Despite his youth, Cyrus establishes himself as an arbiter of Median *paideia* and *politeia* and signals his disapproval of the lack of moral qualities in Astyages' court by openly criticising the behaviour of those around him. The reference to the huge portions of the Median banquets and the drunken celebrations are far removed from Xenophon's description of the stern sobriety of the Persian 'free square', where Cyrus has spent most of his life under the watchful eye of his elders. Cyrus finds the drunken behaviour at Astyages' birthday celebrations both distasteful and subversive, and in the case of his grandfather, unfitting for a king (1.3.10). He treats the drunken outspoken antics of Astyages' friends with sarcasm, saying that his grandfather must have given him his first experience of the political concept of free

⁸ *Ibid.*, 197.

⁹ See Gera 1993, 292 f.

speech, *isēgoria*. Cyrus saves the worst aspect of the drunken revelry until the end of his criticisms. The 'poison' freely imbibed by Astyages and his companions has resulted in Astyages being lowered to their status and forsaking his kingly role,¹⁰ thus removing the appropriate distance and respect which should exist between a ruler and his subjects.

Cyrus sees that Astyages' carousing with his subjects could undermine his position as their leader. He, in contrast to Astyages' cavalier attitude to maintaining regal dignity, is devoted to educating himself for the role of kingship and developing his *epistēmē* of leadership. He has already mastered the essence of the Persian *paideia* for the class of boys, and is superior to all his contemporaries in all aspects of it (1.3.15-17); in order to satisfy his *philomathia* he wishes to stay in Media and to benefit from the personal freedom promised by his grandfather's willing indulgence of all his whims. He therefore has to play a double game of publicly criticising Median customs to show his mother that he remains true to the principles of his Persian *paideia*, and at the same time entertaining and impressing his grandfather in order to ensure that he will be invited to prolong his stay in Media.¹¹ He carefully avoids mentioning the real benefits of staying in Media, citing only his desire for horsemanship as a reason. When Astyages, with typical generosity, offers Cyrus a number of inducements to stay (1.3.14), Cyrus regards them as confirmation that his outspoken behaviour at the dining table has not only been entertaining for Astyages but has also ensured that the opinions and wishes he expressed then have been heeded. Astyages thinks that he has made Cyrus an offer that he cannot refuse, but Cyrus has already dictated the terms which would ensure his acceptance of the offer.

The educational effects of his time in Media can be detected in his approach to creating his empire, not only in his personal appearance (see above) but also in the organisation of his court.¹² In chapter 3 Cyrus has identified the Sacian as a possible

¹⁰ Tatum 1989, 103 f.; cf. Cyrus' comments about the self-indulgence of Cyaxares and the Medes in his conversation with his father (1.6.8).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 105 f.

¹² *Ibid.*, 190.

impediment to his plans of manipulating his grandfather into gratifying all his wishes, so he is deliberately cruel to the servant as a way of asserting his authority over him.¹³ He also recognises the importance of the cupbearer's role in controlling access to the king (1.3.11), and adopts the same principle - of limiting subjects' access to their king - as means of establishing his own kingship and of heightening the impact of his public appearances (7.5.37 ff.).¹⁴ Moreover, his time spent at his grandfather's banqueting table also serves a didactic purpose.¹⁵ His decision to distribute his portion of meat amongst the servants at Astyages' table as he sees fit (1.3.6), can be regarded as an enactment of his knowledge of the idea of retributive justice, which he has gained through a combination of Persian education and observing the customs observed at his grandfather's table.¹⁶ Cyrus' stay in Media gives him two further opportunities to practise justice through remuneration; when he distributes the spoils from his hunting expedition amongst his friends, and when he does likewise with Astyages' presents for him on his departure from Media, both occasions are important as expressions of the stature and authority of a boy who is preparing for adulthood and kingship (1.4.7-11 & 1.4.25-27).¹⁷

Cyrus' Median education not only gives him greater and more practical opportunities to administer kingly justice and gifts than he would have received in Persia, it also gives him a chance to learn about the nature of *pleonexia*: the art of having more than one's due, *to pleon echein*, and of taking advantage of others. The conversation between Cyrus and his mother in Mandane serves to highlight the differences between the constitutions of Media and Persia, and illustrates his eagerness to learn the Median

¹³ *Ibid.*, 104.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 197 ff. & Gera 1993, 286 ff.

¹⁵ See 1.2.8 on the educational effects of communal eating in Sparta.

¹⁶ See Grottanelli 1989, 189 ff.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

application of *pleonexia*.¹⁸

The theme of *pleonexia* is discussed by Xenophon elsewhere in Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia*. In chapter 6 Cambyses and Cyrus consider its applications in warfare and the dangers of teaching it to impressionable youths; Cambyses also highlights the dangers of the desire for self-aggrandisement which has caused the downfall of states (see 1.6.26 ff., 1.6.46 & Synopsis to chapter 6). The concept of *pleonexia* is also implicit in Cyrus' speech to the peers in chapter 5 (1.5.7. ff.), when Cyrus uses the moral justification of defending the Medes and Persians against Assyrian aggression as a pretext for the expansion of Persian power in the Near East (1.5.13 - see Synopsis to chapter 5). In both these passages the concept appears in a purely military context, where the potentially subversive effects of taking advantage over others and claiming more than one's due are mitigated by the notion that helping one's friends and harming one's enemies is essentially just.¹⁹

The context of chapter 3 is different; Astyages is described by his daughter as being a *despotēs* whose rule is *tyrannikos*, and tyrants are characterised by their adoption of *pleonexia* to the injury of their own subjects (cf. *Lac.* 15.8).²⁰ They are able to behave in such a fashion, because, unlike kings, they are not subject to the laws of the *polis* (cf. *Mem.* 4.6.12). Plato, too, associates *pleonexia* with despotic rule; he takes a very negative view of this human trait, regarding it as an evil that caused political decadence and the breakdown of all forms of human life (e.g. *R.* 359C).²¹ This attitude is exemplified in the *Critias* when he describes how 'unjust *pleonexia*' caused the

¹⁸ See Gera 1993, 73 ff. for a thorough and wide-ranging analysis of this scene; see also Tatum 1989, 105 f.

¹⁹ Wood 1964, 47; cf. Socrates' discussion with Euthydemus on the nature of justice in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 4.2.15-16); similar sentiments are expressed in Isocrates' *Panegyricus* (see Rapp 1988, 43).

²⁰ Gera 1993, 77 n. notes that the same idea is expressed in Aristotle's *Politics* (*Arist. Pol.* 1279A & 1313A).

²¹ See Bury 1951, 88.

downfall of the princes of Atlantis at the hands of the Athenians (*Criti.* 121B).²²

Mandane points out to her son that Median-style *pleonexia* has no place in Persia. The organisation of the Persian state of the *Cyropaedia* ensures that equality before the law prevails and that the kings are accountable to the *polis* (1.3.18).²³ Cyrus, however, is curious to learn how the Medes are ruled and how Astyages applies his power over his subjects. His determination to stay causes him to be deliberately disingenuous when replying to his mother. He dismisses his mother's argument by stating that Astyages is expert at teaching others to have less, "μείον ἢ πλεῖον ἔχειν" - the opposite of *pleonexia* - so she need not fear that he will learn this dangerous concept. Cyrus' argument rests entirely on the premise that by remaining in Media he will be treated and will behave exactly like the other subjects of Astyages. Such an outcome, in view of the king's indulgent treatment of him and his promise of future benefits for Cyrus, is extremely unlikely. Indeed, Astyages' behaviour suggests that completely the opposite will happen to Cyrus; he will learn and become accustomed to having more than the Medes. Astyages will not actually teach Cyrus anything, but Cyrus will learn from him. The Median king acts as an example, *paradeigma*, for Cyrus to follow when the latter eventually creates his own empire. As a ruler of a mighty empire Cyrus bows to the reality of controlling and administering a huge number of peoples by realising that it would not be feasible to adopt the Persian *politeia* in Babylon. He therefore puts into practice some of the principles of kingship he had observed during his childhood in Media. Xenophon's transformation of Cyrus into a despotic ruler after the conquest of Babylon, and his apparent abandonment of the ideals he has formerly pursued is thus not so sudden or as disconcerting as it has been portrayed;²⁴ it is signposted in the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* as early as chapter 3 of Book 1.

Xenophon's own attitude to the concept of *pleonexia* in the *Cyropaedia* appears

²² Bury in the introduction to Loeb translation of the *Critias*, draws a parallel between the *pleonexia* of Atlantis with that of fifth century Persia, regarding the princes of Atlantis as prototypes of the Persian king (Bury 1961, 256 f.).

²³ See Rapp 1988, 38 ff.

²⁴ Gera 1993, 286 ff.

to be that it is perfectly acceptable for a general to employ it in warfare; but, in the rule of a *polis* it should be left only to those exceptional individuals with a kingly as opposed to despotic nature - men such as Cyrus, who rule with *epistēmē*, *sōphrosynē* and *dikaiosynē* and who are distinguished through their *genea*, *physis*, and *paideia*. In Plato's *Critias* the princes of Atlantis are undone by their gradual dilution of their divine natures, *physeis theias*, over the generations (*Criti.* 121A-B). The divine *physis* of Xenophon's Cyrus (see Synopsis to chapter 1) does not become degraded in the midst of success, but his successors are lacking in this quality and the Persians decline immediately after his death.

1. δώδεκα ἐτῶν ἢ ὀλίγω πλέονων: At the age of twelve Cyrus is only halfway through the education for the class of boys. Xenophon then states that Cyrus is already far superior to his contemporaries in these activities; and Cyrus himself tells his mother that his teacher has already given him the role of judging his fellow pupils because he understands Persian justice so well, “ὅτι ... με ὥς ἤδη ἀκριβοῦντα τὴν δικαιοσύνη” (1.3.16).

Ἀστυάγης: Astyages has been introduced earlier as king of the Medes (1.2.1). In the *Anabasis* Xenophon mentions that Astyages’ wife, Medea, took refuge in the city of Mespila (Nineveh) when the Persians revolted from the Medes (*An.* 3.4.12-13); in the *Cyropaedia* there is no mention of Astyages having a wife alive. Such a character may have been deemed to be superfluous to the narrative by the author. If she was a figure associated in the minds of Xenophon’s Greek audience with historical accounts of Cyrus’ armed insurrection against the Medes, he may have deliberately avoided referring to her. Xenophon does, however, allude to Astyages possessing concubines in the Median court (see 1.3.11).

ἰδεῖν ... ἐπεθύμει: Astyages’ desire to see his grandson is highlighted by the use of ἐπιθυμεῖν, which not only conveys his eagerness to see Cyrus but also hints at his satisfying his own personal vanity in wishing to see his illustrious descendant.

καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν: Xenophon transposes the Greek term *kalos kagathos* to an exotic oriental setting to describe Cyrus on several occasions, not so much to portray him as a hellenised barbarian but as a character who displays values of modesty and self-restraint, engendered by his Persian upbringing, which are worthy of an Athenian ‘gentleman’, and who, on this occasion, stands out in contrast to his more self-indulgent Median counterparts (see Donlan 1973, 365-374, for a discussion of the origin and precise meaning of the term).

2. παῖς φύσει φιλόστοργος: Another side to Cyrus’ nature, he is naturally affectionate and

therefore able to inspire affection for him in others.

ὥσπερ ... πάλαι συντεθραμμένος: Xenophon in describing the warmth and naturalness of Cyrus' embrace implies that there is an immediate affinity between grandfather and grandson.

ὀφθαλμῶν ὑπογραφῇ ... κόμαις προσθέτοις ... : Cyrus, having come from the austerity of life in Persia, is quick to notice the make-up on Astyages' face and his wig, designed to mask his age. Far from thinking Astyages to be ridiculous Cyrus is sufficiently impressed to later adopt Median dress and to wear cosmetics after he captures Babylon (see Synopsis). In order to emphasise the non-Greek nature of the Median court, Xenophon chooses one of the most striking points of contrast between the Greek and barbarian world - the wearing of cosmetics by men - as the first indication of Median luxury and effeminacy. The wearing of cosmetics also features in the *Oeconomicus* when Xenophon describes Ischomachus discovering his wife wearing them in order to impress him (*Oec.* 10.2 ff. - see Pomeroy 1994, 304 ff. for a discussion of this passage). Xenophon's censorious opinions on cosmetics (and perfume) may have been derived from his experience in Sparta (Pomeroy *ibid.*), but they were far from unique. The attitude of Greek and Roman authors to the wearing of cosmetics was almost invariably unfavourable (Pomeroy *ibid.*; see also Holden 1887, 116 f. for examples of passages on cosmetics by Greek authors). Such attitudes presumably related to the wearing of cosmetics by women, and the notion of men daubing their faces or wearing wigs in order to enhance their appearance would have been unthinkable for a fourth century Greek *kalos kagathos*. In the luxurious barbarian world of Xenophon's Medes this kind of thinking would not apply.

πορφυροῖ χιτῶνες ... : Cyrus distributes the Median robe, *tas Mēdikas stolas*, to his Persian office holders (8.3.1) before his victory parade in Babylon. The brightly coloured purple robes are given to the highest office holders, but Cyrus also provides other Median robes, which are not purple and therefore do not confer such high status

on the wearer, for their friends (8.3.3). In the *Agesilaus* Xenophon describes how Agesilaus makes his soldiers wear purple cloaks at the battle of Coronea, in order to impress the enemy and to disguise the inferior numbers of his army (*Ages.* 2.7-8).

ἐν Πέρσαις ... ἐσθῆτες φαυλότεραι καὶ δίσαιται εὐτελέστεραι: The frugal and austere nature of Persian life is neatly summed up by Herodotus in his account of the advice given to Croesus by one of his subjects, Sandanis (Hdt. 1.71). Cyrus is chided by Cyaxares for the plainness of his robe, “τῇ ... φαυλότητι τῆς στολῆς” when appearing in front of ambassadors of the Indian king (2.4.5). Simplicity of Persian dress is another point of comparison between the Persians and the portrayal of Spartans in Greek literature. Thucydides observes that the Spartans were the first to adopt plain clothing which they still wear to this day (Thuc. 1.6); he also comments that the wealthy Spartans adopted a frugal lifestyle which resembled that of the majority of the citizens which is echoed in the description of the Persian *politeia* in chapter 2 and in Mandane’s assertion of the Persian *politeia* promoting equality of right for its citizens (see 1.3.18).

ὦ μῆτερ ... κάλλιστος ὁ ἐμὸς πατήρ ... : Tatum believes that Cyrus’ first words, which are his excited reaction to meeting Astyages, are his last spontaneous utterances in the *Cyropaedia* (Tatum 1989, 99). Tatum argues that from this point onwards everything else Cyrus says in the work as a whole is calculated to the needs of the situation; however, Cyrus’ conduct in the heat of the first battle with the Assyrians, when he runs towards the enemy shouting exhortations instead of proceeding at walking pace as he had planned (3.3.62), demonstrates that Xenophon did not intend Cyrus’ self-possession to be so perfect as Tatum suggests.

3. παῖς ὢν ... φιλόκαλος καὶ φιλότιμος: Cyrus’ ambition has already been mentioned by Xenophon (see 1.2.1 - see Synopsis to chapter 4 for a discussion of *philotimia* in the *Cyropaedia*). His love of *to kalon* is expressed in his admiration and later adoption of Median finery (see Synopsis). The love of fine things is evidently regarded by Xenophon as distinct from the base craving for money which afflicts all men (8.2.20). The virtues

of the Athenians being *philokaloi* are expounded in Thucydides' account of Pericles' Funeral oration, "Φιλοκαλοῦμεν μὲν γὰρ μετ' εὐτελείας [κτλ.]", 'We are lovers of beauty without extravagance [etc.]' (Thuc. 2.40).

ἐν Πέρσαις ... τὸ χαλεπὸν εἶναι καὶ τρέφειν ἵππους: The mountainous nature of Persia makes it unsuitable for horse-breeding (Herodotus uses the epithet *τρηχὺς*, 'hilly', to refer to the land of the Persians (1.71) - see above; see also Frye 1976, 7 ff. on the physical geography of Iran). Media, in contrast, is ideally suited for this purpose. Median cavalry, according to Cambyses (1.6.10) are the best in the Near East. The force that Cyrus brings to Media is all infantry (1.5.5) and is unable to pursue the Assyrian army after routing them in the first battle. Cyrus therefore proposes that the Persians train to become cavalymen (4.3.4 ff.) which the Persians readily accept, to such effect that Xenophon asserts that no self-respecting Persian gentleman would in his day be seen travelling on foot, "οὐδεὶς ἂν τῶν καλῶν κάγαθῶν ἐκῶν ὀφθεῖη Περσῶν οὐδαμῇ πεζῶν" (4.3.23). By the time of Xerxes' expedition to Greece in 479 B.C., the Persians were already renowned for their skill as cavalymen (Cook 1983, 103).

4. ἡ ὁδός ... ἐπὶ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι: The first analogy in the *Cyropaedia* is, as one might expect from the age of the speaker, simple and direct. Cyrus could almost be reiterating one of the lessons drummed into him by a *didaskalos* in the Persian school of justice for the benefit of Astyages. The path to satiety is a simple one for the Persians as Xenophon has already described (1.2.8) and Cyrus cannot understand why the Medes waste time on winding passages, *eligmoi*, (see Tatum 1989, 103 & 106).

5. γνώση ὅτι ἡδέα ἐστίν: The response by Astyages is equally typical, he tries to humour the boy by introducing him to the idea of *hēdonē*, pleasure. Cyrus counters by pointing out that the Medes' table manners betray their disgust of what they are eating.

6. ἵνα νεανίας οἴκαδε ἀπέλθῃς: Astyages' wish that Cyrus should help himself to the meat placed before him and go home a healthy young man (*neanias* being used in the double

sense of young man and being vigorous), is not, as Bizos argues, an indicator of the lack of nutrition in the Persian diet (Bizos 1971, I, 96), but simply an expression of Astyages' concern in his welfare during his stay.

7. διαδιδόναι τοῖς ... θεραπευταῖς: Even at an early age Cyrus shows a keen appreciation of what is needed to foster loyalty amongst servants, rewarding Astyages' servants with meat for their respective merits and services to him and his mother and grandfather (see Synopsis). The whole incident can be seen as a precursor of Cyrus' later practices on organising his army where worthy individuals are to be singled out for praise and rewards (2.3.2-4) to encourage the existence of a 'meritocracy' in the ranks. When Cyrus returns to Persia after his stay in Media, one of the means by which he regains the admiration and respect of his contemporaries is to give away part of his own portion of food at banquets (1.5.1). Xenophon comments later on in the *Cyropaedia* about Cyrus' generosity with food (8.2.3-4), which is confirmed by his behaviour after his victory banquet in Babylon (8.4.6-7). The practice of rewarding someone with food also appears in the *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia* when Xenophon observes that Lycurgus gave the Spartan kings the right to receive certain parts of animals that had been sacrificed, (*Lac.* 15.2-5 - see Grottanelli 1989, 208 f.), and the honour of receiving double portions so that they could honour anyone whom they chose. Herodotus also mentions the Spartan kings' entitlement to double portions (*Hdt.* 6.57) and in the *Odyssey* the Phaeacian bard Demodocus is rewarded for his singing by Odysseus with a large portion of meat (*Od.* 8.474 ff.).

The incident also serves as a useful illustration of Xenophon's own theories of managing a household, in answer to the problems of controlling servants raised in the opening lines of the *Cyropaedia* (see 1.1.1), and is also consistent with the idea of rewards for servants' loyalty which is discussed in the *Oeconomicus* (*Oec.* 12.6-8).

νῦν γὰρ τοῦτ' ἔχω: 'For this is all that I have [to offer] now'. Cyrus charms his adult audience with a show of modesty, apologising for the nature of the gifts; however, even at this early stage of his life he shows an awareness that one day he will have much

greater gifts to bestow on loyal retainers.

8. ὁ ... Σάκας: Cyrus, when sharing out his food, deliberately ignores the Sacian cupbearer, οἰνοχόος, the servant who controls access to Astyages and therefore represents a potential threat to Cyrus' attempts to impress and petition his grandfather for whatever he wants (on the role of the Sacians in the *Cyropaedia* see (1.1.4)). Although he is a slave he holds an office of considerable importance and influence, and Astyages says that he honours him most of all of his servants, "ὃν ἐγὼ μάλιστα τιμῶ". The cupbearer has a dual role. His main function is to pour and serve the king's wine in the ritual described by Xenophon, whilst also checking for poison (1.3.9). He also acts as a kind of secretary to Astyages, introducing people to the king's presence and refusing admittance if he deems the time to be inappropriate for Astyages to receive them (cf. Homer's use of Hephaestus as a cupbearer in the *Iliad* for comic effect (*Il.* 1.584 ff.) - see Gera 1993, 159 f. for a discussion of Sacas' role in the *Cyropaedia*). The use of the character of the cupbearer may refer to Ctesias' account of Cyrus' rise to power found in Nicolaus of Damascus, whereby Cyrus distinguishes himself as a cupbearer in Astyages' court (see Gera 1993, 156 f. for a discussion of the link between the two authors).

9. πρόσωπον σπουδαίως καὶ εὐσχημόνως ... : Cyrus displays a comic touch to endear himself to his audience, adopting a suitably grave face to exaggerate the importance of the cupbearer's duty. He re-enacts the cupbearer's ritual, expertly mimicking Sacas' actions, much to the amusement of Mandane and Astyages. His threat to remove Sacas from his post is part of the joke he has played, but behind this apparently off-the-cuff remark there is a serious intent. His boyish antics win from Astyages the promise that he will not be denied access to his grandfather (1.3.14). Thus the young boy's clowning masks his strong determination to be Astyages' favourite. In doing so he further demonstrates his willingness to take on adult roles, on this occasion for entertainment but also to demonstrate his own prowess and self-confidence.

εἰ φάρμακα ἐκχέοιεν ... : Xenophon breaks off from the narrative to provide a practical explanation for the existence of cupbearers, namely to taste the king's wine for poison, a threat for later Persian kings as Xenophon explains in his epilogue (8.8.12).

10. ἐν τοῖς γενεθλίοις: Astyages' birthday celebrations with their heavy drinking recall Herodotus' description of Persian *nomoi* (Gera 1993, 159). Herodotus notes that the Persians celebrate birthdays most of all (Hdt. 1.132-3), are extremely fond of wine, and often discuss important matters in an inebriated state. He also describes how drunkenness causes the downfall of Persian ambassadors to the Macedonian court, when another boy - the Macedonian prince, Alexander, who is described as being 'young and lacking in experience of evil deeds' - expresses his anger at the drunken antics of the Persians and takes advantage of their inebriated state to mastermind their assassination (Hdt. 5.18 ff.).

ταῖς γνώμαις καὶ τοῖς σώμασι σφαλλομένους: Xenophon uses the same phrase elsewhere to comment on the pernicious effects of excessive drinking (e.g. 8.8.10, *Lac.* 5.4 and *Symp.* 2.26 - see Gera 1993, 158).

ἃ οὐκ ἔατε ἡμᾶς τοὺς παῖδας ποιεῖν ... : Cyrus, with his mind schooled in Persian justice, immediately hints at the injustice of having one code of behaviour for boys and a different and more lax code for adult men. The boys are presumably expected to be 'seen and not heard' in the Median court, whereas the men, under the influence of their 'poison', are boisterous and act stupidly. The Persian *paideia* does not permit such double standards; all the age groups are bound by a uniform set of moral values from which they cannot deviate. The adults must constantly act as role models for the younger generations so that they would never indulge in the kind of behaviour which Astyages and the Medes enjoy.

ἐπελέλησθε ... ὅτι σὺ ἄρχων: Cyrus' criticism is not so much directed at Astyages becoming drunk as his apparent willingness to behave to allow others to forget his regal

status (see Synopsis). The scene has further importance as it foreshadows the night of revelry that Astyages' son Cyaxares indulges in, while the majority of the Medes desert to Cyrus' army (4.2.11 - see Introduction D (iii)). At a later point in the narrative, Xenophon reveals how wine was the staple drink of Cyrus' army (6.2.26-29). When Cyrus proposes an advance against Sardis, he tells his army and the allies that they will be unable to replenish their stores of wine, so the men should gradually drink less and less of it until they are accustomed to drinking nothing but water. In this way they can avoid sickness caused by a sudden change in diet.

ἡ ἰσηγορία: 'Equal right of speech'. A quintessentially Greek concept is introduced into an oriental setting. Xenophon's use of the word here may seem incongruous, but Herodotus uses the term, which later came to be regarded as one of elements of Athenian democracy, δημοκρατία (Hdt. 5.78), in connection with the Persians during the narrative dealing with the Persian debate on constitutions when Otanes advocates the rule of the people (Hdt. 3.80 ff.). Xenophon depicts Cyrus allowing free speech in the later *symposia* scenes involving his friends and officers in the Persian army, although at this stage in his career he has not developed any notions of isolating himself from public contact as he does in Babylon (see Bizo 1971, I, 15). Even in the relaxed atmosphere of the *symposia* Cyrus is shown to be in complete control of the conversation (2.2.1- see Gera 1993, 132 ff. on the *symposia* of the *Cyropaedia*), and he brushes aside any searching comments or potentially awkward questions with a witticism. He is also able to steer the subject of conversation onto matters he wishes to discuss. On the one occasion that Cyrus appears to invite *isēgoria* in a public debate within all the ranks of his army (2.3.4 ff.), two of his most ardent supporters immediately step in to back up his opening speech and stifle any attempt at proper debate amongst his soldiers.

11. ὁ μιαιώτατος ἀποκωλύει: Even at an early age Cyrus displays the ability to put on a calculated display of his displeasure in order to achieve his own ends (cf. his initial coldness to his former childhood companion, Tigranes, the Armenian prince (3.1.8)).

Στὰς ἂν ὥσπερ οὗτος ... : Cyrus mimics Sacas again for the amusement of Mandane and Astyages. By parodying the excuses the cupbearer has used to deny him access to the Median king, he would pretend to refuse Sacas the right to eat and even when he was desperate Cyrus would use the most effective excuse that the food was occupied with 'the ladies' - presumably Astyages' harem.

12. τὸν τῆς μητρὸς ἀδελφόν: The first mention of the Median prince and heir, Cyaxares, who appears almost incidentally at this point in the narrative but is not named (for further discussion on Cyaxares see Appendix A).

ὑπερέχαιρεν αὐτοῖς χαριζόμενος: Cyrus demonstrates to the Medes his *philanthrōpia* which is a fundamental part of his character (see 1.2.1; see also Rapp 1988, 41 on Cyrus' role as a benefactor in the *Cyropaedia* to the soldiers in his army). Cyrus is also acclaimed as a benefactor, εὐεργέτης, by the people of Armenia (3.3.4).

13. Mandane prepares to depart whereupon Astyages asks her to leave Cyrus with him. Mandane's reply is that it would be difficult for him to stay against his will, although her son has given no indication that he wants to return home. There is no mention of whether Cambyses' opinion should be sought on the matter; Mandane's primary consideration is, she says, to honour her father's wishes.

14. χάριν σοι εἶσομαι ... : Xenophon emphasises the role that obligation plays in determining the relationship between Astyages and Cyrus, and in a wider context the role it has between the ruler and his subject. It is a role that Cyrus fully understands and exploits to confirm to everyone his *philanthrōpia* (see Synopsis to chapter 4).

ἵππους τοῖς ἑμοῖς χρῆσθαι ... : Xenophon has already described Cyrus' joy at learning how to ride (see 1.3.3). Horsemanship is not part of the Persian *paideia*, for the obvious reason that horses are difficult to breed because of the mountainous terrain, a situation analogous with Greece. Cyrus' cavalry skills and bravery are later illustrated in his first

taste of battle on the Median frontier (1.4.18-24).

ὁποῖαν ... ὁδὸν ... : Astyages pokes fun at his grandson's self-professed austerity, employing the same metaphor as Cyrus used to justify his outspoken behaviour at the Median dinner table (1.3.4).

ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ: Xenophon uses Middle-Eastern terminology to describe the royal park (see Tuplin 1990, 22 f. on Xenophon's use of the term *paradeisos* in his works, and on his concentration on its function as a game park in the *Cyropaedia*), being the first Greek author to refer to *paradeisoi* (see Hirsch 1985, 149 n.3)).

15. At this point in the narrative Astyages is presumably absent, leaving mother and son alone to discuss Cyrus' future frankly and in confidence. Cyrus has no hesitation in telling Mandane that he wants to stay. In the eyes of Mandane, a former Median princess who now represents Persian conservatism, Astyages and the Median court is already exerting a powerful and insidious influence on Cyrus. This Median influence affects the young boy's responses to his mother's argument and gives the whole scene extra tension. Xenophon suggests that mother and grandfather are in effect competing for the soul of Cyrus.

οἶκοι ... εἰμὶ καὶ δοκῶ κράτιστος ... : Cyrus is unafraid to proclaim his own virtues: it was the news of his superiority over the other Persian boys that led Astyages to invite him to Media.

ὅταν δ' εἰς Μήδους ἔλθω: Xenophon once again foreshadows the narrative by having Cyrus suggest that he will return to Media as an adult and as a military ally.

16. A critical exchange follows between mother and son, Cyrus is not afraid to stand up to his mother and argue his case. Mandane realises that she cannot dispute her son's desire to learn horsemanship, so she turns to the central tenet of Persian education,

justice, *dikaiosynē*, which Cyrus cannot learn in Media (see Tatum 1989, 105 f.). Cyrus is not thrown off balance by the validity of Mandane's words, and replies with a self-confidence bordering on arrogance that not only is he far ahead of his Persian contemporaries in physical skills but has also grasped the concept of justice. At such an early age he is basically dismissing the Persian *paideia* as a system which can no longer teach him anything or offer any new challenges to his burning ambition.

πληγὰς ἔλαβον: See 1.2.6 on the severity of Persian discipline.

17. ἡ δίκη τοιαύτη: Cyrus chooses to illustrate his knowledge of justice with an example, not of his making a correct decision but an incorrect one and being punished accordingly. He is presenting the case for his remaining in Media by recounting a judicial case from his own education. The example is chosen by Cyrus to show him learning, albeit painfully, from experience, but also to display Persian education in the best light - his teacher enforces strict discipline which has the desired effect on the star pupil. The tale also conforms to the image of Cyrus dispensing summary justice at an early age to his contemporaries, which is depicted in Herodotus' account of his life (Hdt. 1.114). Cyrus is punished for not applying himself to the principles of justice, which is the purpose of his education, and for presuming that a utilitarian, rather than a technically correct solution, was best. He was warned that even when he had reached manhood and had such power over other people, he should remain conscious of the inviolability of the rights of possession, *κτησίς*, and the injustice of force, *βία*, on such occasions.

τὸ μὲν νόμιμον δίκαιον εἶναι, τὸ δὲ ἄνομον βίαιον: The teacher ends his lecture with a simple antithesis: what is lawful is just, what is unlawful is unjust; the judge must always cast his vote on the side of the law. The same idea is expressed in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 4.3.13-16).

18. οὗτος ... ἐν Μήδοις ... δεσπότην πεποίηκεν ... : The contrast between Median and

Persian government is made explicit (see Synopsis). Astyages on the one hand is master of all he sees and answerable to no one. Cambyzes is the opposite, he is a *primus inter pares*. Astyages is thus the typical oriental ruler, whose vices are exemplified by the figure of Cyrus' son Cambyzes, the despotic king of the Persians in Herodotus, the ruler who was regarded by the Persians as a *despotēs* (Hdt. 3.89).

ἐν Πέρσαις δὲ τὸ ἴσον ἔχειν δίκαιον νομίζεται: Xenophon's Cambyzes, the father of Cyrus, on the other hand, represents an apparently totally different system of government based on justice and equality (cf. the notion of government by equality as espoused by Euphron of Sicyon in the *Hellenica*, but his support for democracy is merely a pretext for him becoming a tyrant (*HG* 7.1.45 ff.))

ὁ σὸς πατήρ: Mandane deliberately mentions Cambyzes in the conversation in order to emphasise her arguments, and to remind Cyrus of his responsibilities back home. Cyrus in turn will mention her father to remind her of her filial responsibilities and her own Median background.

τὰ τεταγμένα ... τῇ πόλει: The actual relationship between Persian king and the state in the *Cyropaedia* is only mentioned by Cambyzes in his welcoming speech to Cyrus on the latter's triumphant return to his homeland. The Persian king makes his son agree to a number of conditions regarding his future relationship with the Persian *polis* (8.5.22 ff. - see also 1.5.4 on the Persian *koinon*).

μέτρον δὲ αὐτῷ οὐκ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀλλ' ὁ νόμος ἐστίν: Mandane encapsulates the Persian ideal of the society, described by Xenophon in the previous chapters, whereby the laws control the individual, no matter how exalted his position.

μαθὼν ... ἀντὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ τὸ τυραννικόν: Mandane finishes her argument with a basic warning, of severe physical punishment for Cyrus if he returns with inflated ideas. She rightly fears that Cyrus is preparing to embrace the despotic ideals of Median kingship.

τὸ πλεόν: Mandane equates tyranny with *pleonexia* over one's subjects (see Synopsis).

Chapter 4

Synopsis

In chapter 4 Xenophon expands on the three themes introduced in the previous chapter: Cyrus' superiority to the Medes, his desire to educate himself by seeking new, character-developing experiences, and to enhance his understanding of the nature of *pleonexia*. He also highlights two important attributes of Cyrus' character, his *philotimia* and *philanthrōpia*, which shape his subsequent career as general and ruler. Xenophon's account of Cyrus' conduct in this chapter shows that, even at a remarkably early age, the Persian prince is capable of displaying the forethought, *pronoia*, which is the hallmark of great leaders and which will distinguish him from the other rulers portrayed in the *Cyropaedia* (see Appendix C on the importance of *pronoia* in kings). During the four years he spends in Media, Cyrus is able to ingratiate himself quickly and assuredly not just with his grandfather, but also with his grandfather's subjects, building friendships which will prove to be invaluable when he reaches manhood and has to count on Median support for the furthering of his ambitions. The Persian *paideia* described in chapter 2, with its emphasis on strict discipline, equality of treatment and blind obedience, offers little scope for a talented individual such as Cyrus to express himself through his courage and audacity, or to form such lasting friendships by virtue of his generosity.

Chapter 4 is accordingly devoted to the development of Cyrus as an individual, as he passes from childhood to adolescence. Due notes correctly that in describing this development of Cyrus, "Xenophon gives a description of a change of behaviour, not of fundamental qualities".¹ Xenophon skilfully illustrates this maturing of Cyrus by opting not to give a simple chronological summary of his time in Media, but to depict instead a series of biographical vignettes relating to two areas of Cyrus' life which were dear to him, and in which he was to become extremely proficient: hunting and warfare. Cyrus is portrayed as possessing a curious mixture of childish exuberance and manly courage,

¹ Due 1989, 155 f.

and of adolescent introspection but complete self-confidence in his own abilities. The effectiveness of this depiction of Cyrus' adolescence is exemplified in the final scene of the chapter, the '*paidikos logos*' (see Appendix B). Cyrus, as the handsome and impressive youth on the point of departure for Persia, is confronted by an older Median admirer, Artabazus. He treats the Mede with courtesy and shows himself to be a model of *sōphrosynē*, but he also carefully avoids discouraging Artabazus' ardour for him, because he recognises that such devotion can be put to good use at a later date as the narrative will show.

Cyrus seeks to inspire devotion to himself among the Medes as soon as his mother has left for Persia, winning the hearts of the his contemporaries and also their fathers by acting as an intermediary for them with Astyages (1.4.1). He secures his hold on his grandfather's affections by attending to the Median king's every need (1.4.2). As he becomes older his former garrulous and affectionate manner changes to one of modesty and self-consciousness (1.4.3-4), and he accordingly becomes more attractive company for his elders. He also distinguishes himself amongst his Median contemporaries by mastering the skills of their *paideia*, which revolve around horsemanship and hunting (1.4.5). When he tires of killing the animals in Astyages' *paradeisos* he seeks permission to hunt in the wild, which Astyages eventually grants (1.4.6-7). Cyrus is allowed to go out on an expedition with his uncle, Cyaxares, and some retainers, who warn him of the dangers of hunting (1.4.8). Cyrus pays little heed to these warnings when he brings down a deer and a boar at close quarters; he is oblivious to the danger or the subsequent reprimands for his foolishness by the servants and Cyaxares, asking only for an opportunity to display his prey to Astyages (1.4.9). The bemused Median king does not chastise him, indeed he allows his grandson to distribute the game among his friends (1.4.10). Cyrus does so, boasting about his hunting experiences and encouraging his friends to ask their fathers for permission to accompany him next time (1.4.11). When they reply that such a decision rests with the king and ask him to intercede with Astyages, Cyrus is reluctant to help them, remembering the problems he had in gaining permission for himself (1.4.12). However, when he is faced with losing his status amongst his contemporaries as a benefactor, he

seeks to persuade Astyages to allow them all to go hunting, first by means of a hypothetical argument, then by sulking (1.4.13-14). Once again Astyages eventually gives in to his grandson's will, organising a great hunt involving the all the males of the court, both young and old (1.4.15).

After three or four years at the Median court, Cyrus is suddenly presented with a new opportunity to distinguish himself, when the prince of Assyria hunts near the Median border and decides to make an incursion into Median territory, backed by a large force of cavalry and infantry (1.4.16-17). Astyages' response is to confront the Assyrian raiding party, leading a small force to the border, which includes his son, in order to repel the enemies (1.4.18). In the midst of the confusion in the Median court, Cyrus accompanies the force unobserved by his grandfather but is not reprimanded or sent away. When the two forces are facing each other, Cyrus proposes a bold plan of action to attack the Assyrian hunting party which is separate from the main body of troops; his plan is accepted by Astyages (1.4.20). Cyaxares leads the charge of part of the Median contingent, but is completely upstaged in the skirmish by the unsolicited appearance of Cyrus, who inspires those around him to put the Assyrians to flight (1.4.21-22). In his eagerness Cyrus comes dangerously close to engaging the main body of the enemy army, and Astyages is forced to intervene with the rest of the Median cavalry to protect both his son and grandson (1.4.23). The whole Assyrian force is subsequently routed and Cyrus exults in his success by lingering on the corpse-strewn battlefield, to his grandfather's amazement and displeasure (1.4.24). The news of Cyrus' manly exploits reaches Persia, and, as a consequence, Cyrus is summoned home by his anxious father in order to complete his Persian *paideia* (1.4.25). Cyrus departs with great sorrow and with a number of gifts from his grandfather, which he distributes amongst his Median friends (1.4.26). When he is on the point of leaving a Median nobleman, Artabazus, declares his love for Cyrus (1.4.27). He uses as a pretext the Persian custom of kinsmen greeting and parting with each other with a kiss to claim two kisses from Cyrus, who is moved by Artabazus' devotion to him and promises to return soon to Media (1.4.28). Cyrus' stay in Media thus ends as it began, with a display of affection and loyalty involving Cyrus which highlights his ability to charm and inspire others. On the first

occasion he had been a young boy eager to impress his grandfather (1.3.2-3), on the second he is a youth of sixteen who is admired not just for his physical beauty, but also for his *philotimia* and *philanthrōpia*.²

Cyrus' *philotimia* is listed as one of his defining characteristics in chapter 2 (see 1.2.1). The concept appears several times in Xenophon's works in a number of different contexts, which renders it difficult to translate with precision: 'ambition', 'zeal', 'eagerness', 'love of praise (or honour)' and 'pride' are the most obvious translations of the term. On the whole it is treated by Xenophon as a positive moral quality, one which distinguishes mankind from other animals (*Hier.* 7.3 - see 1.6.25). He is aware that in some individuals *philotimia* is a dangerous quality when it has an excessive grip on their characters.³ In the *Memorabilia* he notes that Alcibiades and Critias - two controversial figures of recent Athenian history - were unique in that they were the 'most ambitious of all Athenians', who wished to control everything and outdo everyone (*Mem.* 1.2.14). They therefore could never have adhered to the sober, disciplined lifestyle of their former mentor Socrates. In the same work the Athenians in general are characterised by their love of honour (*Mem.* 3.1.13). In the *Hellenica* Epaminondas is swayed by his *philotimia* into risking a second battle at Mantinea, rather than return to Thebes with his reputation tarnished by his lack of success in the Peloponnese during that campaigning season (*HG* 7.5.18-19). The result is a battle which costs him his life and leaves the whole of Greece in greater confusion than ever.

Xenophon, however, did know of one historical leader who had exemplified *philotimia* in the best possible sense of the word; in the *Agesilaus*, the Spartan king is praised as being *philotimotatos* and by virtue of his most eager love of honour he had

² See Farber 1979, 505 ff. for a discussion on how these two qualities were part of the defining characteristics of Hellenistic kingship.

³ Cf. Thucydides' account of the causes of *stasis* in Corcyra, which he attributes to *philotimia* being combined with *pleonexia* in some individuals, "πάντων δ' αὐτῶν αἴτιον ἀρχὴ ἢ διὰ πλεονεξίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν" (Thuc. 3.82).

never known defeat (*Ages.* 10.4).⁴ Agesilaus' fictional counterpart in this respect is Cyrus of the *Cyropaedia*, whose words and deeds embody the positive effects of love of honour (1.2.1, 1.3.3 & 1.4.1). In the work as a whole there are no portrayals of the negative effects of *philotimia*; although on one occasion Xenophon attributes Cyrus' concern that his army should engage the enemy as soon as possible to the 'zeal' of his soldiers in the training contests he had devised for them (3.3.10). The keenness of competition had led to jealousy between some of them which would be best resolved through the common dangers of actual warfare. Elsewhere in the work Cyrus' army are imbued with positive ambition in battle (e.g. the first battle against the Assyrians, where *philotimia* is listed as one of ideal qualities of an army (3.3.59)). Such a quality is essential because it inspires in men willingness to carry out hard physical work,⁵ and bravery.⁶ Cyrus, as a general and future king, plays an appropriate role in imbuing his soldiers with this spirit as he is fully aware of its importance in their training and actual warfare (2.1.22).⁷ Furthermore, one of the reasons that Cyrus chooses eunuchs for his bodyguard is that their physical deformity does not mean they are less *philotimoi* than ordinary men (7.5.63).

In chapter 4 it is this love of honour which motivates Cyrus to challenge his Median contemporaries to contests in pursuits he has not yet mastered (1.4.5-6). He is unafraid to lose to others knowing that he will eventually surpass them in everything.

⁴ Cartledge 1987, 142 f. notes that *philotimia* alongside *philonikia*, competitiveness, were dominant characteristics of Spartan society and were prized as virtuous qualities. The competition between members of the élite of the professedly egalitarian Spartan society was extended to day-to-day workings of politics, "this intestine struggle was sometimes dignified under the title *philotimia*" (*ibid.*), and had damaging repercussions when Sparta had hegemony in mainland Greece.

⁵ Cf. *Symp.* 8.37 where Autolycus is motivated by *philotimia* in his training to be a victor in the pankration.

⁶ Cf. *Mem.* 3.1.10 where Socrates notes that the first line of troops going into battle should be the most ambitious, *philotimotatoi*, and Dionysodorus agrees, saying that such men will face danger for the sake of praise.

⁷ Cf. *Eq. Mag.* 1.25, 2.2 & 7.3 where *philotimia* is regarded as an essential quality for the cavalry commander's troops.

The same motivation can be found in his insistence before Astyages' great hunting expedition that he should not receive preferential treatment and be allowed to hunt first before the other boys (1.4.15). Cyrus' competitive instincts are such that he wants everyone to compete on equal terms with him in order that his superiority to them should become even more apparent. There is also a less positive side to Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus' *philotimia* in chapter 4, which manifests itself in his reckless bravery, *θρασύτης*, in two moments of acute danger to his life - whilst hunting in the wild for the first time (1.4.8) and during his cavalry charge against the Assyrians (1.4.21). However, such rashness is attributable to his youthful exuberance, and when he reaches adulthood he has matured into a model of caution and prudence. His *philotimia* is then directed towards the enhancement of his army and the new state he is forging, both of which can be seen as extensions of his own efficient and hard-working personality. The love of *timē* drives him on to endure hardships and danger as this leads to *eukleia*, a good reputation, and the desire for fame, as he tells his former adversary Croesus, makes all things bearable (8.2.22).

Cyrus' *philotimia* is also inextricably linked with his philanthropy, *philanthrōpia*. This link is neatly summed up in Book 8 of the *Cyropaedia* (8.1.39), when Cyrus is described as using his philanthropy to encourage others to be *philotimoi* in their efforts to impress him. *Philanthrōpia*, unlike *philotimia*, is always regarded as a positive quality in Xenophon's works.⁸ In the *Oeconomicus* Xenophon praises agriculture, γεωργία, as a philanthropic activity (*Oec.* 15.14 & 19.17). Both Cyrus the Younger and Socrates are commended by Xenophon for their generosity and love of mankind (*An.* 1.9.22 ff. & *Mem.* 1.2.60). In the *Cyropaedia* Gobryas praises Cyrus for being even better at philanthropy than generalship, and Cyrus replies that philanthropy gives him more pleasure than generalship (8.4.7-8).⁹ On his deathbed he commends himself for burial, noting that as he has always been *philanthrōpos* he is glad to be united with the

⁸ See Due 1989, 163 ff. for a discussion of *philanthrōpia* in the *Cyropaedia*.

⁹ See Hoistad 1948, 23 ff. on the importance of *philanthrōpia* as a defining characteristic of the Cynic conception of the ideal hero, in particular in the myths surrounding Heracles.

earth which confers such benefits on mankind (8.7.25 - cf. the link between γεωργία and philanthropy expressed in the *Oeconomicus* (see above)).

Xenophon also provides a telling illustration of the philanthropy of kings in the *Agesilaus*, when he describes the Spartan king's treatment of native peoples during his campaigns in Asia Minor (*Ages.* 1.20 ff.). Agesilaus seeks to win over the local peoples through kindness, and treats prisoners of war with clemency. He was thus able to gain control of *poleis* which had impregnable walls, not by force, but by virtue of his *philanthrōpia* (*Ages.* 1.22). Thus Xenophon demonstrates how the philanthropy of a ruler is motivated as much by self-interest as by genuine love of mankind. The king gains the support and friendships that are essential to the maintenance of his power, through the willing obedience of his subjects. Cyrus is shown to be the counterpart of Agesilaus in his adoption of *philanthrōpia* for utilitarian purposes. In Book 8 of the *Cyropaedia* his philanthropy is described as the best method of combating threats to his personal security (8.1.48). He recognises that the greatest danger to his life comes from some of the nobles at his court who command large numbers of troops. They think themselves competent rulers and have access both to his bodyguards and to himself (8.1.46). Cyrus therefore has to win the love of his subjects by a number of means, including sharing in their toil and sympathising with them, as he did in the early stages of his career when he had little money (8.2.1). When he does acquire money and power Cyrus regards the giving of food and drink from his table to be a very effective form of kindness (8.2.2 ff. - see 1.3.7 and Synopsis to chapter 2 on the boy Cyrus' distribution of meat). He also institutes the practice of the Persian king giving many gifts, "πολυδωρία", a practice that continues down to Xenophon's day (8.2.7), and in Cyrus' case made him more popular with his subjects than members of their immediate families (8.2.9). Thucydides also confirms the Persian kings' practice of giving rather than receiving presents in Book 2 of his work, when he mentions that the Thracian kings do exactly the opposite of what the Persians do, and will not do anything for their subjects unless they have received gifts (Thuc. 2.97).

Xenophon's picture of Cyrus' benevolent despotism as a ruler of an empire has its roots in his childhood experiences at the Median court. In chapters 3 and 4 of Book

1 Cyrus is himself the recipient of Astyages' generosity and he learns to emulate his grandfather in his dealings with the Medes. His acts of generosity are far more calculated than his grandfather's and show that even at an early age Cyrus is imbued with foresight, *pronoia*. Astyages' *philanthrōpia* is shown to be directed primarily at Cyrus, and its main purpose is to ensure that his grandson is happy in Media. Cyrus, in contrast, actively seeks out people to whom he can give gifts and favours and thus win their lasting friendship. In chapter 4 he demonstrates his *philanthrōpia* initially by taking advantage of his privileged position in the Median court to act as an intermediary with Astyages for his Median friends' fathers (1.4.1). He thus effectively usurps the role of the cupbearer Sacas in acting as a conduit between Astyages and his subjects, passing on requests to the king that they might not have dared to make themselves, placing them under an obligation to him, and in the process gaining valuable insight into the workings of the Median court. Xenophon describes further displays of philanthropy by Cyrus when he recounts his desire to distribute the spoils of his first hunting expedition amongst his friends (1.4.10-11) and to secure for them the chance to enjoy the same experiences of hunting in the wild (1.4.13-14). His insistence after leaving Media that his friends receive the gifts given to him by Astyages, despite the Median king's attempts to make him keep them (1.4.26), and his allowing Artabazus to kiss him (1.4.27-28) are further signs that he has mastered the art of giving to secure friendships.

This policy of generosity towards the Medes is eventually rewarded when Cyrus seeks to undermine the role of his uncle, Cyaxares, in their campaign against the Assyrians. When the opportunity arises to turn their initial defeat of the enemy into a rout, Cyrus realises that he will need Median horsemen to help in the pursuit (4.1.11). Cyaxares is reluctant to give chase, preferring to savour the spoils of the first victory (4.1.13 ff. - see Introduction D (iii) for an analysis of his speech), but he allows Cyrus to recruit those of the Medes who are willing to accompany him. At this point Cyrus turns to Artabazus, the former recipient of kisses from him, and asks him to help recruit the Medes to his cause (4.1.22). Artabazus has not forgotten Cyrus' former act of *philanthrōpia* towards him and solemnly swears his allegiance to Cyrus. The success of Artabazus' recruitment and the effect of Cyrus' childhood philanthropy in Media is

highlighted by almost all the Median nobles joining his pursuit and leaving their own king to his drunken revelry (4.2.10-11).

Xenophon describes the Medes as deserting their king for a number of reasons which had their origins in his childhood stay in Media. They remember Cyrus as a child and cherish their former friendship with him. They also have fond memories of his conduct during their hunting expeditions with him (4.2.10). Some look on him as a saviour from the Assyrians, others, in a phrase which recalls Astyages' hopes for the young Cyrus (1.4.25),

καὶ ἐλπίδας ἔχοντες διὰ τὸ ἄνδρα φαίνεσθαι ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐτυχῇ, καὶ μέγαν ἔτι
ἰσχυρῶς ἔσεσθαι αὐτόν. *Cyr.* 4.2.10

They had hopes, seeing that the man was noble and fortunate, that he would one day be even more great and powerful.

What is more, they have received favours from him or from his grandfather, which have all been due to his *philanthrōpia*. The author does, however, show that not everyone is motivated by Cyrus' generosity. He adds a touch of realism to balance his impressive picture of the Medes being in awe and indebted to Cyrus, by stating that many others were lured from their camp by reports of the rich plunder to be taken from the fleeing Assyrians.

1. πολλὰ ἐλάλει ὁ Κῦρος: ‘Cyrus talked a great deal in such a manner [on this occasion]’. Xenophon’s use of λαλεῖν, a verb which often conveys the sense of chattering, prattling or talking inarticulately (e.g. Pl. *Euthd.* 287D, which is apparently the first prose attestation of the word (Hawtrey 1981, 115)), could be interpreted as an attempt to trivialise Cyrus’ contribution to the previous argument between Mandane and himself (1.3.15-18; Holden translates the word as ‘chattered’ (Holden 1887, 136)). Cyrus himself later admits that when he was younger he has was renowned for his talkativeness, “λαλεῖν ἐδόκουν εἶναι” (1.4.12). The verb was also simply used as an alternative to λέγειν (*LSJ* s.v. I.3), and in view of Xenophon’s portrayal of the boy Cyrus as being clever and cunning, this sense of the word is far more appropriate here (Gera 1993, 77 n.). Xenophon appears here to be simply hinting at Cyrus’ youth and excitability, which make him on occasion too talkative, “πολυλογώτερος” (1.4.3), without belittling Cyrus’ arguments.

τοῖς ἡλικιώταις: Xenophon refers here to the sons of Median nobles, who are presumably required to be in constant attendance at the Median court. When Cyrus begins to organise his court in Babylon, Chrysantas proposes that the Persian nobles should always be in attendance at Cyrus’ court in order to perform whatever task he might require them to do (8.1.5). Chrysantas’ proposal is accepted and Xenophon notes that this practice is still adopted by the Persian king’s subjects in Asia (8.1.6).

φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν: See Synopsis for a discussion of these two qualities in Cyrus.

2. Cyrus consolidates his relationship with Astyages, acting as servant, nurse and confidant in a display of devotion to the ailing king, which is intended to impress not only Astyages but also those around him, as they witness Cyrus’ open displays of concern and grief over the king’s illness. Astyages’ son Cyaxares is conspicuous by his absence in these descriptions of his father’s infirmity. Xenophon depicts Cyrus as staking his claim not only to the Median king’s affections, but also to a future role in the

Median court. Astyages' illnesses are a cause for genuine concern for Cyrus as he is completely dependent on his grandfather's favour during his time in Media. There would be no guarantee of his being allowed to stay if Astyages died, and Cyaxares became king. Cyrus would therefore be unable to consolidate his influence in the Median court or advance so far in his independent development as he desired.

ὥστε παντάπασιν ἀνεκτίσατο τὸν Ἀστυάγην: Cyrus' first conquest in the *Cyropaedia* is his grandfather's heart. He has completely won over Astyages, just as he said he would when imitating the Sacian cupbearer (1.3.9). He realises that people, not material possessions, are the most important things for an ambitious young prince to acquire.

3. Καὶ ἦν μὲν ἴσως ... πολυλογώτερος: Xenophon ventures what could be construed as a derogatory opinion of Cyrus. This judgement is quickly qualified and ascribed to Cyrus' education, and is also shown to be the result of his personal qualities, his *philomathia* and quickness of mind, so that what starts out as a criticism ends in unabashed praise. Cyrus does not complacently accept the benefits and luxuries of life in Media, but is depicted as questioning everything and everyone around him. It is this inquisitiveness that leads Cyrus to question the values of not only Median society, but also of his own Persian society (see 1.5.10 ff.).

διὰ τὴν παιδείαν ... : Further insight is given into Xenophon's view of Persian education and the judicial processes which require its pupils to be able to account for all their actions, and to be able to judge the accounts of others. Fluency in speech is therefore necessary and Cyrus as the star pupil is especially fluent. Xenophon shows how, even at an early age, the habits encouraged by the Persian education are ingrained in Cyrus. His initial adherence to the habits of his former Persian lifestyle, such as being outspoken (e.g. his behaviour at Astyages' banquet (1.3.4 ff.)), distinguish him from the other inhabitants of the Median court.

τὸ φιλομαθής: See Synopsis to chapter 3 for a discussion of Cyrus' *philomathia*.

ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν σώμασιν ... ὅμως ἐμφαίνεται τὸ νεαρὸν ... : Xenophon goes to great lengths to defend Cyrus' talkative nature. He likens Cyrus to a pubescent youth who has developed physically at an early age but whose behaviour and speech shows a youthful spirit, τὸ νεαρὸν, which reveals his lack of years, ὀλιγοετία.

οὐ θράσος ... ἀλλ' ἀπλότης καὶ φιλοστοργία: Xenophon suggests that Cyrus' talkativeness is not regarded by the Medes as a sign of 'impudence', rather of 'frankness and affection'. In the *Hellenica*, the adjective ἀπλότης is used to describe the honesty of the Spartan polis (*HG* 6.1.18). Polydamas of Pharsalus commends the Spartans for their straightforward admission that they were unable to defend his city against Jason of Phraeae. Cyrus has already been described as being naturally affectionate, "παῖς φύσει φιλόστοργος" (1.3.2).

4. The maturing of Cyrus results in the disappearance of his ἀπλότης and φιλοστοργία, which had so charmed Astyages when he first arrived in Media. The advent of puberty is described by Xenophon as a time when Cyrus removes any rough edges to his character, which have stemmed from his austere Persian lifestyle, and thus can be charming, "ἐπίχαρις", in the company of others. He develops a reserve and inscrutability, which in his adult years acts as a screen for his ambitions and intentions and which he does not allow to slip. Xenophon also stresses the competitive side to Cyrus' character. His burning desire to outdo others in every activity marks him out as a potentially great leader, a man who earns respect through his continual demonstration of his superior abilities, which in itself is a prerequisite of good generalship, as his father Cambyses later tells him (1.6.22-23). Xenophon also gives his audience an insight into the Median *paideia* for boys. The concentration on archery and spear-throwing is similar to that of the Persians (1.2.8), but in Media these pursuits take place on horseback. It is significant that the ethical element of Persian education, learning justice, is not mentioned by Xenophon as being part of the Median *paideia*. Cyrus throws himself wholeheartedly into developing his skills as a horseman in preparation for the day when he requires this skill in warfare.

τὸ σκυλακῶδες: 'His puppy-like manner' (Miller 1914, I, 47). Xenophon uses the device of likening the young Cyrus' behaviour to that of a hunting dog on two further occasions in chapter 4. Cyrus' exuberance during the large-scale hunt of the Median court is described as similar to that of a well-bred hound, σκύλαξ γενναῖος, in the chase (1.4.15). His reckless cavalry charge against the Assyrian hunting party is likened to that of a well-bred but inexperienced hound, "κύων γενναῖος ἄπειρος", charging against a boar (1.4.21).

5. Cyrus' refusal to be discouraged by initial shortcomings in the art of horsemanship, his willingness to accept defeat as a stage of the learning process he has decided to undergo, enables him to master the skills and surpass his contemporaries. Indeed, his love of the chase as practice for the art of war leads him to ask for new challenges, as he has exhausted the supply of wild beasts in Astyages' paradise. Cyrus is sufficiently emboldened to ask his grandfather for permission to go out hunting in the wild with his uncle present in order to watch over him, even though he is still in his early teens, and at an age when his contemporaries in Persia are still learning justice and the rudiments of warfare. Astyages, in turn, is placed in a difficult position by such a request. Having enticed Cyrus into staying with the promise of an upbringing free from the restrictions of the Persian *paideia* he is unwilling to curb Cyrus' enthusiasm for hunting. He is also reluctant to expose his grandson and heir to the Persian throne to the perils of hunting in the wilds at such a young age (another aspect of the dangers of hunting is illustrated in the tale Gobryas tells of the murder of his son by the Assyrian prince on a hunting expedition (4.6.3 ff.) - see 1.4.15; cf. also Hdt. 1.34 ff. on the unfortunate fate of the Lydian prince, Atys, during a hunting expedition with Adrastus). What is more, he is not obliged to honour Cyrus' request, having only promised to furnish Cyrus with wild beasts within the confines of his paradise (1.3.14). In the following account of Cyrus' first 'proper' hunt Xenophon draws on his own wide experience of horse-riding and hunting to convey the excitement and rapidity of action involved in the chase, where the hunter is completely intent on his prey to the exclusion of all else and where the margin of error, between killing and being killed, is slim (Xenophon also describes the thrill of

horseback hunting of wild beasts in Mesopotamia during the march of Cyrus the Younger's army (*An.* 1.5.1)).

ταχὺ μὲν ... ταχὺ δὲ ... : Cyrus' progress from being inferior to the Medes in horsemanship, to becoming their equal, then surpassing them to the point when he has run out of beasts to kill in the royal park, is presented as happening in a series of rapid stages with an inevitable conclusion.

τὸ ἐρᾶν τοῦ ἔργου: Cyrus' love of hunting - the subject which dominates the narrative for the rest of Cyrus' stay in Media - stems from the opportunities it offers for training in warfare. Cyrus is well aware that the techniques and qualities required for hunting - courage, endurance, stealth, horsemanship, skill with the bow and the spear - will stand him in good stead in warfare (see 1.2.9). He therefore pursues them with a zeal which astonishes his Median friends and relations. His first two military encounters - the border skirmish with the Assyrian hunting party (1.4.19 ff.) and his capture of the rebel Armenian king (2.4.16 ff.) - are described by Xenophon as extensions of his previous hunting experiences, using hunting terms and imagery to describe them.

ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ: See 1.3.14 on Xenophon's use of Near Eastern terms. See also Anderson 1985, 57 ff. on Xenophon's descriptions of hunting in the Near East.

6. ἀλλ' ὀκνηρότερον προσήει: Cyrus' childlike appeal is unlikely to impress Astyages and the youth now resorts to an entirely opposite approach to win him over. He abandons his former openness and familiarity with his grandfather and deliberately withdraws from any close contact with the Median king, allowing the Sacian cupbearer to treat him like any other subject in the Median court and to dictate when he can and cannot visit Astyages. In doing this he is able to win over the grateful Sacian who had previously been abused by Cyrus for simply doing his job efficiently (1.3.8 ff.).

7. ὁ Ἀστυάγης ... ἐκπέμπει αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ θείῳ: Cyaxares is given his first contribution to

the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* (see Appendix A on the character of Cyaxares).

οἱ ὄνοι οἱ ἄγριοι: Wild asses are described in more detail in the *Anabasis* (*An.* 1.5.1). Their speed renders them difficult prey for horsemen to catch, but Xenophon's favourable comparison of their flesh with venison, shows that the effort involved in hunting them was justified.

8. Cyrus' first hunting adventure is described as happening in a condensed blur of action, during which he encounters two wild beasts, in two separate incidents which immediately follow each other.

οὐδεν ἄλλο ὁρῶν ἢ ὅπη ἔφευγε: Cyrus immediately forgets one of the lessons he has just learned, namely to be on his guard about the terrain he is traversing, and sets off in blind pursuit of the deer he has just seen.

μικροῦ κακεῖνον ἐξετραχήλισεν: 'Almost threw him [Cyrus] over his head'. The verb ἐκτραχηλίζειν is used in its proper technical sense (*LSJ* s.v. I.1). Xenophon thus depicts Cyrus as coming very close to a premature death. The next occasion on which he endangers his life whilst on horseback occurs during the battle for Sardis. Cyrus' horse is wounded by an enemy soldier in the belly and in its agony throws him off "πληγὲς σφαδάζων ἀποσεῖται τὸν Κῦρον" (7.1.37). The danger is averted when he is rescued by his soldiers and is able to mount another horse to re-enter the fray (see Howie 1996, 209 f. for a discussion of Homeric background of this scene). Xenophon makes it clear that this time he is more in danger of death from landing prone in front of the enemy than from the actual fall from his horse. Cyrus proves to be luckier than Abradatas whose fate in the same battle has previously been described, when he and his men are thrown off their horses due to the crush of men and arms on the battlefield and are easy prey for the enemy soldiers (7.1.32).

οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἐπέμεινεν ὁ Κῦρος μόλις πῶς: 'However, Cyrus clung on, but not without

some difficulty'. It should be remembered that both Greek and barbarian horsemen did not have the benefit of stirrups, or the modern saddle or curb to assist them in such situations. Cyrus' feat in hanging on to his horse, described by a man who clearly had a thorough knowledge of horses and how to control them, is a combination of tremendous skill, courage and horsemanship for one so young. His audacity is fittingly rewarded with the kill of an exceptionally large and impressive deer, "καλὸν τι χρῆμα καὶ μέγα".

καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα ἡνιᾶτο: Cyrus' overwhelming joy in bringing down the deer is soured by the reprimand he receives from the anxious guards, who arrive on the scene of his triumph and warn him that they will report his reckless behaviour to his grandfather. Cyrus' angry reaction to their words is typical of the impetuous, self-confident youth Xenophon has described in the preceding chapters. Just as he was angered by the Sacian cupbearer preventing him access to Astyages, so Cyrus is angered by the admonitions of the understandably worried guards.

κραυγῆς: Xenophon is referring to the hunting practice of shouting to warn other huntsmen of the sighting of prey (cf. Xenophon's description of hunting hares in the *Cynegeticus* where the huntsman is advised to shout loudly to incite and spur on his hounds and netkeeper (*Cyn.* 6.17 ff.)).

εἰς τὸ μέτωπον: Cyrus displays no fear of the boar in riding to meet it as it rushes from cover and his aim at the boar has to be good otherwise he risks death, and fortunately for him he hits the boar in exactly the right spot, between the eyes, to ensure that it is killed outright rather than wounded (Xenophon gives a detailed account of the methods of capturing and killing a wild boar, as well as stressing the considerable dangers involved for the huntsmen, in the *Cynegeticus* (*Cyn.* 10.9 ff.)). Throwing a javelin whilst mounted was an important, and very difficult, part of Greek cavalry tactics against infantry marching in line, which Xenophon identifies in the *Hipparchicus* as a cavalry commander's second task in training recruits, after teaching them to mount properly

(*Eq. Mag.* 1.6). In his treatise on horsemanship, *Peri Hippikēs*, Xenophon recommends that in battle a horseman should use as an offensive weapon two Persian javelins of cornel wood, “τὰ κρανείνα δύο παλτά”, rather than the long spear, normally favoured by the Greeks, which is weak and awkward to handle (*Eq.* 12.12). Cyrus appears to be using this kind of javelin in the hunting trip described at this point in the *Cyropaedia*. The smaller, more manageable, wooden javelins would have been ideal weapons for the youth, who did not have adult strength to wield a large spear. Moreover, if he was carrying two javelins, he would have been able to remount quickly on hearing the halloo, without retrieving the one which he had used to kill the deer - which is just how Xenophon describes the scene. Xenophon also recommends that horsemen should throw their first javelin at the longest range possible in order to gain maximum time to turn their horses and to prepare to throw the second javelin (*Eq.* 12.13). Cyrus does not have the luxury of time when faced with the onrushing boar and consequently his achievement in killing the beast seems even more formidable (Cyrus the Younger is also credited with a formidable hunting exploit in the *Anabasis*, when he is dragged from his horse by a charging bear but manages to grapple with it and kill it (*An.* 1.9.6)).

9. Ποίει ὅπως βούλει· σὺ γὰρ νῦν γε ἡμῶν ἔοικας βασιλεὺς εἶναι: ‘Do what you want; for you seem to be the king over us now’. Cyaxares gives in to Cyrus’ request to be allowed to show his two kills to his grandfather with a sarcastic comment. The prophetic nature of his words will become all too apparent to him later on in the work when he finds himself removed from control of the Median and Persian army by Cyrus and effectively no longer the king of his own people (cf. his own tearful account of how Cyrus’ has humiliated him by causing the majority of the Medes to leave his camp in favour of serving Cyrus (5.5.8 ff.)). Xenophon implies that Cyaxares is jealous of his nephew’s courage and skill, and, above all, of the way Cyrus has a strong hold on his father’s affections (see 1.4.15 on jealousy as one of the dominant qualities of oriental despots). He rightly suspects that Cyrus’ reputation will be increased, not diminished, when Astyages sees the magnificent beasts that the youth has killed single-handed.

10. Xenophon depicts a vivid scene of Cyrus displaying his hunting triumphs in front of Astyages. Cyrus makes the most of his hunting success, bringing in the animals to him and carefully displaying the blood-stained hunting spears in a prominent position, as further proof of his exploits (cf. Pindar's depiction of the prodigious hunting exploits of Achilles from the age of six onwards in his third Nemean ode (*N.* 3.43 ff.). Achilles would slay wild boars and carry their still-panting bodies to the centaur Cheiron, "σώματα δὲ παρὰ Κρονίδαν | Κένταυρον ἀσθμαίνοντα κόμιζεν").

Astyages does not rebuke Cyrus, he is bemused rather than angry. He finds it difficult to comprehend that Cyrus, as one so young and of such important status, is willing to risk his life in killing wild beasts to set before him. Such behaviour, exposing oneself to such danger for the sake of a couple of wild beasts, is not expected of a royal prince in Media. When he politely tells his grandson that he has little need of the beasts, Cyrus already has a response in mind, asking Astyages if he can divide up the beasts and distribute the game amongst his friends. Cyrus does not only want to impress his grandfather; he also wants to show off his prowess to his Median contemporaries and to make a public display of his *philanthrōpia*. Above all he wants to win their trust and friendship by sharing the spoils of his victory with them, a policy he will adopt as an adult after his victories over the Assyrians (e.g. 8.3.1; cf. *Ages.* 1.17-19 where Agesilaus ensures that his friends receive large quantities of booty which can be resold at great profit).

11. Cyrus extols in front of his friends the virtues of hunting in the wild, as opposed to hunting in the manufactured environment of the paradise. He contrasts the fine specimens he has brought in to show them, with the emaciated and crippled beasts which he and his friends had killed in Astyages' park, in order to fire his friends with the same zeal for hunting as he possesses. Cyrus not only wants to dictate the activities of his own *paideia* whilst in Media; he also wants to influence the upbringing of his friends, by bringing them along with him to hunt. His speech is another example of the accurate and vivid piece of characterisation of a self-confident and impetuous youth, who wants praise for his achievements. Xenophon depicts Cyrus as exaggerating the attributes of the

beasts in the wild with poetical language, and emphasising the faults of the unfortunate beasts in the paradise. The boy also conveniently ignores the danger he has just faced and plays down the skill and strength needed to hunt beasts in the wild - the kind of beasts which he describes as being 'impossible to miss' because of their size.

His friends subsequently point to him as the obvious choice to act as an intermediary between them and the king, as it is Astyages, not their fathers, who must give them permission to hunt in the wild. They do not realise that Cyrus no longer feels that he can be as open and affectionate with his grandfather as he once was, nor employ the same methods of persuasion on him (1.4.6). At this point Cyrus has conflicting loyalties: to his friends whom he is trying to cultivate as future companions and helpers, and to his grandfather to whom he owes his position at the Median court (Tatum 1989, 107). The result is that Cyrus finds himself temporarily unsure of the position he occupies in the court hierarchy, "ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅστις ἄνθρωπος γεγένημαι". He is unsure of the course of action he should take, whether he should appease his contemporaries, or keep a respectful distance from Astyages. His friends leave him with the threat that someone else will have to be found to take his place. What may seem to be a childish squabble has greater significance as one of the few times in the work where Cyrus finds himself embarrassed as a result of his not having thought through the consequences of his actions or his words. However, his sense of *aporia* is typically short-lived and he resolves to confront the problem immediately.

ὥς μὲν καλὰ, ὥς δὲ μεγάλα, ὥς δὲ λιπαρὰ ἐφαίνετο: 'How beautiful, how big, and how sleek they looked'. Cyrus cannot contain his wonder at seeing beasts of prey in their natural habitat, and emphasises their superiority to the mangy beasts of the paradise.

αἱ ... ἔλαφοι ὥσπερ πτηναὶ ἤλλοντο πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν: 'The deer leaped up to the sky like winged creatures' (cf. Sophocles' *Philoctetes* where the archer hero laments that he will never again encounter 'winged game', "πτανὰ θῆραι" in the mountains (*Ph.* 1146)). The equation of deer with birds in flight is paralleled by the analogy of horse-riding being similar to flying. When Cyrus proposes that the Persians should create a cavalry force

he is eagerly supported by Chrysantas, who is keen to learn horsemanship and so become like 'a man on wings', "ἄνθρωπος πτηνός" (4.3.15). The same idea is also expressed in the *Hipparchicus* when Xenophon asserts that practising horsemanship is infinitely more pleasurable than the toil of gymnastic exercises, for if a man desires to fly, no action of mankind is more similar to flying than being on horseback (*Eq. Mag.* 8.6).

οἱ δὲ κάπροι ὥσπερ τοὺς ἄνδρας φασὶ τοὺς ἀνδρείους ὁμόσε ἐφέροντο: 'The boars charge at close quarters just like they say brave men do [in battle]'. The link between warfare and hunting is made explicit. Cyrus is already thinking of his triumph over the boar in terms of bringing down a brave opponent in battle. Xenophon's inclusion of "φασί" to qualify Cyrus' comparison of boars with brave men in battle, shows that even in the midst of eulogising hunting in the wild Cyrus is still careful enough not to lay himself open to accusations that he is talking of something - namely brave men's conduct in battle - of which he has no experience.

12. παιδάριον δ' ὦν δεινότατος λαλεῖν ἐδόκουν εἶναι: 'When I was little boy I was regarded as being very clever with words'. Cyrus, with some regret, contrasts his current subdued behaviour with his former outspokenness, when he could talk freely without feeling self-conscious (see 1.4.1).

13. This argument between grandfather and grandson is analysed in depth by both Tatum and Gera (Tatum 1989, 108-10 & Gera 1993, 28-30). Tatum argues that the conversation is "an ingenious trap" in which Cyrus has anticipated Astyages' reaction (Tatum *ibid.*, 109). Cyrus raises the issue of receiving punishment from his grandfather, confident in the knowledge that Astyages would shy away from prescribing the kind of physical punishment for his grandson which he describes as being fitting for a runaway slave. Cyrus demonstrates that he is mature enough to realise why Astyages metes out stern punishment to slaves who desert their posts, but he does wish to complain about the restrictions which apply to him and his friends by drawing a specious analogy between the hypothetical slave's situation and his own. Gera underlines the Socratic

nature of the conversation between Cyrus and Astyages, showing, with reference to passages in the *Oeconomicus* and *Memorabilia* (*Oec.* 10.3-7 & *Mem.* 2.1.1-17 - see Gera *ibid.*, 29 n. for further examples in the *Memorabilia*), how Cyrus uses the Socratic method of inviting an interlocutor to judge a hypothetical case then apply that judgement to himself, with Cyrus in this instance being cast in the role of Socrates. Cyrus' technique is sound, but he fails to win over Astyages because the latter's immediate concerns for Cyrus' safety outweigh the merits of the youth's argument.

Tatum is right in supposing that Xenophon does not portray Cyrus as wanting to win immediately the argument with Astyages. To do so would run the risk of testing the latter's patience. He seeks only to fulfil his two aims when he planned to confront Astyages, stating directly what he and his friends want and at the same time doing it in such a way as not to irritate his grandfather. He does not even attempt to ask for permission to go hunting but states his intention to do it, "ὥς βουλευομαί ... σε ἀποδρῶ". Astyages welcomes his frankness and promptly quashes the idea, but not before Cyrus has implanted feelings of doubt and guilt in the Median king's mind over his blunt refusal. These feelings will sway the old king when Cyrus reverts to sulky behaviour to achieve his ultimate goal.

ἤν τις ἀποδράσῃ σε τῶν οἰκετῶν ... : Cyrus uses the same analogy in his exhortation to his troops as they prepare to pursue the Assyrian army after the first battle (4.2.21). He stresses the need for them to display courage in front of the enemy, promising them that if they do so, they will see the enemy behave like a bunch of runaway slaves, "ὥσπερ δούλων ἀποδιδρασκόντων", begging on their knees for mercy or trying to run away or not knowing what to do.

The analogy of the miscreant slave also appears in the *Cyropaedia* in the 'trial' of the Armenian king (3.1.9 ff. - see Tatum 1989, 134-43 and Gera 1993, 78-98 for analyses of the scene). The trial gives him another opportunity to use the Socratic technique of inviting his interlocutor to judge a hypothetical situation, then successfully using the judgement against the interlocutor. On that occasion the adult Cyrus, sitting in judgement of a bewildered captive, is naturally in a far stronger position than the child

who is eager to go out hunting, but who is wary of his grandfather. In the role of judge, instead of petitioner, Cyrus can therefore pursue his questioning to whatever end he wishes, without fear of being overruled. His opponent, like Astyages, is not able to match Cyrus' cunning or argumentation (Cyrus' domination of his Armenian opponent had already been confirmed when he had previously reduced the king to a state of *aporia* by surrounding the Armenian forces (3.1.6)). The king is forced to condemn his own conduct through his responses, and is again reduced to a state of *aporia* when asked for his judgement on what kind of justice should be dispensed to him (3.1.13).

εἰ ἔνεκα κρεαδίων τῇ θυγατρὶ τὸν παῖδα ἀποβουκολήσαιμι: Astyages states his determination not to let Cyrus stray from the palace and lose his daughter's son for the sake of a few pieces of meat, just as a careless herdsman might lose a stray animal. Astyages' determination to protect his grandson is reminiscent of Herodotus' account of how Croesus endeavours to protect his son Atys and to prevent from him going hunting (Hdt. 1.36 ff.). Astyages, like Croesus, is ultimately unsuccessful in his efforts to stop Cyrus hunting but does not pay the heavy price that Croesus does for allowing his son to hunt. Xenophon's use of ἀποβουκολεῖν adds another Herodotean influence to the dialogue (Gera 1993, 29 f. notes the combination of Persian and Socratic influences on this scene). In Herodotus' life of Cyrus Astyages plays exactly the opposite role to his counterpart in the *Cyropaedia* - he entrusts the infant Cyrus to a cowherd, βουκόλος, in order that the child may be lost and suffer the fate of any stray sheep discovered by wild beasts. Xenophon has to portray Astyages in the *Cyropaedia* in "an altogether more positive light" (*ibid.*, 30). He is cast in the 'herdsman role' (cf. 1.1.2 on the analogy between ruler and herdsman), as the guardian and protector of Cyrus; but there is also a clever irony in having Astyages - the king made notorious to the Greeks through Herodotus for ordering the exposure of his grandson, and then for having the son of his loyal retainer Harpagus butchered and served up to the unwitting father - express his concern to protect Cyrus from wild beasts. The reference to the bits of meat recalls Harpagus' gruesome feast and serves to increase the irony of his remarks. In Herodotus' work Astyages deliberately fails to protect his grandson and suffers the

consequences - it is left to an actual herdsman to save and protect the future ruler of Media and Persia and fulfil the symbolic role expected of the king.

14. βουλόμενος χάρισασθαι: Astyages eventually capitulates to Cyrus' sulking. The relationship between grandfather and grandson is characterised by both parties recognising their obligations to each other. Cyrus at this point deliberately places himself in a position where Astyages has nothing to gain from being firm with his grandson, but can be seen to be *philanthrōpos* if he gives in and grants another favour to Cyrus.

συνελάσας εἰς τὰ ἱππάσιμα χωρία τὰ θηρία: Xenophon gives the reader a brief insight into the procedures and preparation which characterise a royal hunting trip in the Near East, the size and scale of which stands in stark contrast with the rustic simplicity of Greek methods for hunting hares, described in the *Cynegeticus* (see Anderson 1985, 63 ff. for a discussion of visual and written sources on Near Eastern hunting). Part of the preparations for the hunt involves driving prey from their cover to flat open country suitable for horses (cf. 1.4.17 where the Assyrian prince sends out members of his hunting party to scour the land for wild beasts).

βασιλικῶς δὴ παρὼν αὐτὸς ἀπηγόρευε μηδένα βάλλειν, πρὶν Κῦρος ... : Xenophon refers to a feature of court etiquette in Persia, which he transposes to Astyages' court, prohibiting anyone from casting a spear or shooting an arrow during a hunt before the king or member of the royal family (Holden 1887, 148). In Photius' summary of Ctesias' *Persika*, Megabyzus, the brother-in-law of Artaxerxes I, is punished for not obeying this rule (*FrGH* 688 F14). In the course of a royal hunt, Artaxerxes is attacked by a lion and Megabyzus sensing the danger kills it with a spear cast. The king is enraged that Megabyzus cast his spear first and immediately orders that Megabyzus be executed, but is subsequently persuaded to send him into exile.

15. ὥσπερ σκύλακι γενναίῳ: See 1.4.4 and Introduction D (ii).

οὐδ' ὅπωςτιοῦν φθονερῶς: Cyrus' lack of jealousy in praising his friends' success in the hunt is a sign of *philotimia* and *philanthrōpia*. This scene has a number of points of comparison with another passage in the *Cyropaedia* on hunting (4.6.3-4), which is used by Xenophon to show Cyrus in a favourable light compared to his future foe the Assyrian prince. Gobryas tells Cyrus how he lost his only son, who was murdered during a hunting trip in the company of the then Assyrian prince. The prince had invited Gobryas' son to compete with him in the chase, just as Cyrus secures for his friends the opportunity to hunt with him in the wild. Both the Assyrian prince and Cyrus are confident in their superior ability as horsemen, although in the Assyrian prince this confidence is based on arrogance, not actual ability. Cyrus is secure in his knowledge of his own superiority over his friends, and is willing to accept others earning praise in the hunt, whereas the latter is enraged when he is seen to be worsted by his hunting companion. Although the Assyrian prince is able to control his anger the first time his hunting companion beats him to the kill of the beast, on the second occasion he is unable to restrain his jealousy and kills Gobryas' son (cf. Herodotus' reference to the jealousy, *phthonos*, of despotic monarchs in the Persian 'constitution debate', where Otanes argues that despotic monarchs not only incur jealousy among their subjects but, contrary to logical behaviour, are also jealous of everyone around them (Hdt. 3.80).

... πᾶσιν ἡδονῆς μὲν καὶ ἀγαθοῦ τινος συναίτιος ὢν, κακοῦ δὲ οὐδενι: '[Cyrus thus spent most of his time] being a source of pleasure and some good to everyone, but of evil to no one.' Xenophon neatly sums up the overall effect of Cyrus' *philanthrōpia* on the Medes during his stay at the court (cf. his similar description of Socrates in the *Memorabilia*, "δίκαιος δὲ, ὥστε βλάπτειν μὲν μηδὲ μικρὸν μήδεν, ὠφελεῖν δὲ τὰ μέγιστα τοὺς χρωμένους αὐτῷ" (*Mem.* 4.8.11)). The only exceptions to Cyrus' general philanthropic behaviour is his initial treatment of the cupbearer Sacas (1.3.11) and his sulking in front of Astyages (1.4.14).

16. Ἀμφὶ δὲ τὰ πέντε ἢ ἑκκαίδεκα ἔτη γενομένου αὐτοῦ: Xenophon throughout the *Cyropaedia* follows a vaguely defined chronological pattern. In his chronicling of

Cyrus' early years he is less concerned with providing exact ages or exact time periods, but, using instead the first three stages of the Persian *paideia* as a guideline, is more interested in showing how Cyrus was given the opportunity to prove how much more advanced he was than his contemporaries in both Media and Persia. At the age of fifteen or sixteen Persians are still in the class of *paides* and have another year to go before joining the class of *ephēboi* (1.2.8), where they begin hunting. They then have to wait another ten years before being classed as men, at which point they are regarded as eligible for warfare (1.2.13). Cyrus having already been hunting in his early teens, now finds himself two steps ahead of the Persian system by being involved in actual combat.

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀσσυρίων βασιλέως γαμεῖν μέλλων ... : Cyrus' greatest enemy is introduced with characteristic anonymity by Xenophon. There is no attempt made to name him or develop his character; as later events unfold the Assyrian prince, who succeeds his father after the latter's death in the first pitched battle between Cyrus and the Assyrians, is treated as little more than a cipher, a despotic figure whose behaviour and career neatly opposes that of Cyrus in his apparent arrogance and cruelty and his eventual defeat (see 1.1.4 on the historical identity of Xenophon's Assyrians). The closest historical equivalent to the Assyrian prince of the *Cyropaedia* has been thought to be Belshazzar the son of Nabonidus (this view is suggested by Hirsch 1985, 77 - see Roux, G. 1992, 386 f. on the history and fate of Belshazzar king of Babylon). Gera proposes Nabonidus as the more likely candidate for Xenophon's Assyrian prince, citing Near Eastern sources which portray the Babylon king in a bad light (Gera 1993, 262 ff. - see Cook 1983, 27 ff. & Lehmann-Haupt 1932, 152 ff. on accounts of the downfall of Nabonidus in Greek and Near Eastern sources). However, she rightly concludes that "there is no simple way to identify the two Assyrian rulers of the *Cyropaedia* with any pair of historical Babylonian kings" (Gera 1993, 264). The age of the Assyrian prince is not given by Xenophon, but from the way Xenophon seeks to compare him with Cyrus he is to be regarded as a contemporary of Cyrus. Xenophon refers to him in a conversation between Cyrus and Gobryas as a 'young man', νεανίσκος, who has recently come to the throne (5.2.27). Xenophon's reference to the Assyrian prince's desire to hunt and to

bring back the spoils for his wedding is clearly influenced by Herodotus' account of the speech of Atys to his father Croesus (Hdt. 1.37), begging the Lydian king to allow him to hunt the Mysian boar (Holden 1887, 149 - see 1.4.13 on the influence of Herodotus' account of the death of Atys on this part of the *Cyropaedia*). Atys reminds his father that warfare and hunting were once held to be the finest and most noble pursuits for men like himself to win good renown. He feels frustrated and humiliated because he has now been prevented from following these pursuits and gaining the honour due to a prince (unlike the young Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia*). By denying him the opportunity to hunt, Croesus is diminishing his status, not only in the eyes of the people, but above all in the eyes of his wife, whom he has recently married at his father's behest.

διὰ τὸν πόλεμον: Xenophon suddenly mentions without prior explanation the war between the Medes and Assyrians, although nothing in the preceding events has given any indication of the Medes being at war. Moreover, it is not until a later point in the narrative that the Assyrian king musters an alliance with the intention of attacking the Medes and Persians (1.5.3-4). The Assyrian prince is clearly wary of the Medes and their famed cavalry, and the bravado with which he embarks on his hunting expedition conceals the care he takes not to endanger himself, “ὅπως οὖν ἀσφαλῶς θηρώῃ”.

17. ἐβουλεύσατο οὖν κράτιστον εἶναι λεηλατῆσαι ἐκ τῆς Μηδικῆς ... : With the arrival of his relief guard at the frontier, the Assyrian prince uses the opportunity of having extra military strength to extend his hunting expedition into a general foray over the Median border. Not only does he wish to obtain extra game for his wedding feast from the rich Median hunting grounds, he also wants to assert Assyrian power by a conspicuous display of strength in enemy territory. In depicting the Assyrian prince going beyond the limits of his territory, Xenophon sets up a crucial early encounter between Cyrus and the Assyrians, which will foreshadow the former's later victories over the latter.

18. πρῶτον τότε ὅπλα ἐνδύς, οὐποτε οἰόμενος: ‘Then for the first time he put on his armour, never thinking [that he would be so fortunate].’ The depiction of the ritual arming of

the warrior before battle dates back to the formulaic portrayal of the *aristeia* of the Homeric hero, and elements of the *aristeia* appear in subsequent Greek literature (see Howie 1996, 197-217 on the *aristeia* in post-Homeric literature and the *Cyropaedia*, when Xenophon depicts events leading up to and including Cyrus' victory over Croesus (6.4.1-7.1.49); Howie also identifies elements of the *aristeia* in a fragment of Alcaeus' poetry (fr. 357 *L-P*), and possibly in the myth of Heracles' conflict with the Hippocoontidae as preserved in Pausanias (Paus. 3.15), another possible source, in historical writing, is Thucydides' account of Brasidas' outstanding personal role in the defeat of the Athenians at Amphipolis (Thuc. 5.8 ff.)). Cyrus' armour has been given to him by his grandfather as one of the many gifts he receives whilst in Media, and his first symbolic arming is portrayed by Xenophon as an instinctive reaction to an opportunity that not even he could have hoped to foresee (cf. another example of an instinctive reaction to an impending battle occurs in the *Anabasis*, when Cyrus the Younger responds to the confusion in his army caused by reports that the Persian king's forces were approaching, ready for battle, by leaping from his chariot and arming himself and ordering everyone to follow his example (*An.* 1.8.3)). Cyrus' joy and single-mindedness in putting on the armour removes any prudential considerations about his own safety, and acts as a reminder that his first experience of battle comes at a very early age. The whole idea of his participating in a battle would have been an anathema not only to his family but also to his Persian teachers.

19. On their arrival at the Median border Astyages explains to Cyrus the dispositions of the large enemy force which confronts them. The inexperienced Cyrus asks Astyages to identify the two groups of horsemen who constitute the enemy. It is hard to imagine Cyrus being in any doubt as to who the enemy was. The dispositions of the two sides would have made clear who was Mede and who was Assyrian, but a scene involving identification of one's enemy was an important and dramatic prelude to the actual battle, used by Homer in the *teichoscopia* scene of the *Iliad*, where Helen identifies the leaders of the Greek forces for the benefit of Priam (*Il.* 3.121 ff.). In Herodotus' work Demaratus performs a similar task for Xerxes before the battle of Thermopylae, telling

the king which of the Greeks opposing him are Spartans (Hdt. 7.209).

πονηρῶν ἱππαρίων: 'Poor little ponies'. Cyrus, having spent the last few years in a land famed for its horsemanship, is unimpressed by his first sight of the Assyrians, and above all, of their horses.

ὅσον τὸ στίφος τῶν ἱππέων ἔστηκε συντεταγμένον: Astyages' caution is a result of his focusing on the large body of troops drawn up in close order in front of him. It would run contrary to normal tactics to charge such an apparently formidable force; moreover, the Medes are not yet at full strength and Astyages assumes that his men are vulnerable to counter-attack. Cyrus, in contrast, has no patience with ways of thinking that are blinkered by the conventions of warfare, and argues for the division of the Median forces in order to concentrate an attack at the enemy's weakest point (Xenophon advocates the same strategy of using only a select part of one's forces when attacking an enemy superior in numbers, in the *Hipparchicus* (*Eq. Mag.* 8.12).

20. Cyrus joins the cavalry charge led by his uncle, even though his grandfather had earlier told him to stay by his side (1.4.18). He does not wait to receive permission from his grandfather, recognising that Astyages would certainly not allow him to participate in the skirmish. The Median king is left to watch, almost as a helpless bystander, as his grandson endangers life and limb in leading the charge against the Assyrians.

καὶ ἅμα θαύμαζων ὥς καὶ ἐφρόνει καὶ ἐγρηγόρει ... : 'And whilst marvelling at how he [Cyrus] showed such understanding and alertness ... '. Astyages for the second occasion during the expedition is astonished by Cyrus' precocity and also his maturity for his age in assessing the situation so coolly and cleverly. Although only fifteen or sixteen Cyrus is already playing the role of king just as Cyaxares had sarcastically suggested during his first hunting trip (1.4.9). When Cyaxares leads the Median advance Cyrus quickly assumes a position at the head of the attacking force and the ensuing action is described wholly from Cyrus' viewpoint, as if he, not Cyaxares, were the leader of the Median

cavalry.

21. The Median charge succeeds in dispersing the foraging Assyrians, but Cyrus is not satisfied with this achievement. He goes beyond what Astyages had ordered, by continuing the pursuit in order to harass the enemy, killing and capturing them, which stirs the main body of the Assyrians into action.

οἱ δ' ἀμφὶ τὸν Κῦρον ... πρῶτος δὲ ὁ Κῦρος: Xenophon makes it clear that the Medes are following Cyrus, not Cyaxares, as he tries to prevent the Assyrians from retreating. Cyrus, as he will later do as an adult in battle (e.g. 3.3.62), leads from the front, not sparing himself or showing any fear of the enemy. The men around him respond to his vigour and act in the same manner.

*Ὡσπερ δὲ κύων γενναῖος ἄπειρος ... : See 1.4.4 on Cyrus being likened to a dog; see also Introduction D (ii) on Xenophon's use of similes.

22. Cyrus continues his frenzied pursuit of the foragers, forcing the rest of the Medes, including Cyaxares, to follow him. Astyages watches with alarm as Cyrus leads the charge towards the advancing main body of Assyrians, and is forced, against his better instincts, to launch a full assault on the enemy to rescue Cyrus.

ὑπὸ τῆς χαρμονῆς ἀνακαλῶν τὸν θεῖον: Cyrus, in his love of battle, is described in terms reminiscent of a Homeric hero (see Introduction D (ii)). Xenophon shows that the overwhelming emotion for Cyrus during his first experience of combat is pure joy. His eagerness and excitement combine to raise him to a state of frenzy, which blots out other feelings such as caution or fear and makes him treat this experience in the same manner as one of his hunting trips. The Cyrus who called out to his uncle to continue the pursuit of the enemy is adopting the same approach to events as the boy who calls out to friends to spur them on in the hunt (1.4.15), but he has been transposed to an adult situation. Cyrus is thus shown to be in some ways still a boy, but in others a man.

ισχυρὰν τὴν φυγὴν τοῖς πολεμίοις: The retreat of the enemy (the foragers, not the main body, στίφος, of Assyrians) becomes a rout because of Cyrus' persistence.

ὁ Κυαζάρης μέντοι ἐφείπετο, ἴσως καὶ αἰσχυνόμενος τὸν πατέρα: 'Cyaxares, however, followed, perhaps feeling ashamed in front of his father'. Cyrus has become totally absorbed in the pursuit of the enemy, whereas Cyaxares has been left to reflect that events are taking place under the gaze of his father and that he, whilst not doing anything wrong, has done nothing to distinguish himself. His young nephew has completely usurped his role as leader of the Median cavalry charge, leaving him in the role of a mere participant. He is reduced to responding to the promptings of a fifteen or sixteen year old boy. Xenophon implies that the whole encounter with the Assyrians becomes a humiliating experience for the Median prince, and is made doubly so by his father witnessing his subservience to Cyrus.

οἱ ἄλλοι δὲ εἶποντο, προθυμότεροι ὄντες ... : Xenophon shows the inspirational effect of Cyrus' bravery and eagerness on the other men, who follow Cyrus willingly and not through compulsion. The whole scene serves to confirm, not only for Cyrus himself, but also for everyone around him and to Xenophon's audience, his aptitude for commanding and inspiring other men.

ἀπρονοήτως: Xenophon deliberately repeats the adverb used in the wild boar simile (1.4.21), stressing that in the heat of battle the men involved in the charge have temporarily taken on a collective will and personality inspired by Cyrus' reckless bravery. Astyages, from his position, is able to observe what his son and grandson, caught up in the battle, cannot see. He watches with growing apprehension for the safety of Cyaxares and Cyrus as the Median cavalry approach in a disorganised manner, "ἀτάκτως", the main body of Assyrians, who outnumber them and are advancing in battle order (see 1.6.14 on military tactics in the *Cyropaedia*).

23. The Assyrians are preparing for a conventional Near Eastern cavalry skirmish and

do not expect to become involved in close quarter fighting with the enemy. They halt their own advance and assume positions to let fly their spears and arrows in the expectation that the Medes will do the same. Thus the sudden and unbroken advance of Cyrus and the Medes, driving the remnants of their foraging party before them, comes as a great surprise. At close range their arrows and spears are no longer effective, and they do not have time to wonder at the Medes' audacity in charging them, as the appearance of Astyages and the main body of the Median forces as support to Cyrus causes panic in the ranks and they flee back to the frontier.

The simple but effective description of the culmination of Cyrus' first military experience is drawn from Xenophon's own experiences as a cavalry commander. Xenophon writes as someone not only intimately acquainted with cavalry tactics but also with the behaviour of men in battle, both leaders and rank and file. He also had seen warfare in the Near East through his experiences in the army of Cyrus the Younger and in the service of Agesilaus. There is implicit criticism in Xenophon's description of the Assyrians' tactics of the Near Eastern style of fighting, both past and present, which is portrayed as being ponderous - he informs us here that cavalry skirmishes can often last all day, "μέχρι ἑσπέρας", and are often inconclusive. From the Persian Wars onwards Greek commanders had successfully exposed the weaknesses of Persian and Near Eastern armies, countering their reliance on cavalry skirmishing and their lack of heavy armour, by use of well-drilled heavily armed hoplites fighting in close formation (cf. Xenophon's account of the success of Greek hoplites at the battle of Cunaxa (*An.* 1.8.17 ff.), and of Agesilaus' defeat of Tissaphernes at the river Pactolus (*Ages.* 1.31-2 & *HG* 3.4.23-4); see also Anderson 1970, 41, and Sekunda 1989, 89 ff. on Persian tactics at the battle of Plataea). When Cyrus returns as an adult to Media in order to prepare to fight the Assyrians, his first step is to secure heavy arms for all his men to use in fighting at close quarters (2.1.9 ff.).

The overall success of his cavalry charge demonstrates to Cyrus how the Assyrians (and the other peoples of the region) are vulnerable to any quick, well-directed frontal attack from a small, but well-motivated force. He employs the same tactic to defeat the Chaldaeans (3.2.1-10), when the Armenians in his army act as a decoy by

retreating from the enemy and luring them into facing the charge of the Persians. The victory over the Assyrians also shows Cyrus the value of not following the conventions and rules of warfare and leadership, in order to disorientate and to panic the enemy.

τοὺς μὲν ἀλίσκομένους ἔπαιον καὶ ἵππους καὶ ἄνδρας, τοὺς δὲ πίπτοντας ἔκαινον: The ferocity of the combined Median pursuit matches that of Cyrus' charge; the Medes spare neither horses nor men (cf. the *aristeia* of Ajax in Book 11 of the *Iliad*, where he kills both men and horses in his fury (*Il.* 11.497)).

τοῖς πεζοῖς τῶν Ἀσσυρίων: Xenophon refers to the infantry stationed at the frontier by the Assyrian prince (1.4.17). Although it is not stated in the narrative, Xenophon implies that Astyages is now back in full control of the Median operation. The Median king's caution leads him to decide not to risk an engagement against the infantry and to stop the pursuit. He has no information of what forces the Assyrians have behind their own frontier and his priorities are to avoid any loss of men on his side by taking on the infantry or to be drawn into an ambush by entering Assyrian territory. The reader is left to wonder what the impetuous boy Cyrus would have done in such a situation, if he had been in command.

24. οὐκ ἔχων ὃ τι χρὴ λέγειν: Astyages' attitude throughout the whole cavalry skirmish has been one of incomprehension and disbelief of the actions of his grandson.

μαινόμενον ... τῇ τόλμῃ: See Introduction D (ii) for a full discussion of this scene and its antecedents in Greek literature.

25. διὰ στόματος ... καὶ ἐν λόγῳ καὶ ἐν ᾠδαῖς: See Introduction D (i) on Xenophon's apparent use of Persian sources, and literary antecedents for this phrase.

ὃ τε Ἀστυάγης ... ὑπερεξεπέπληκτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ ... Καμβύσης ... ἦδετο: Cambyses reappears in the narrative and his comparatively mild reaction to Cyrus' fame in Media is deftly

contrasted with the hyperbolic, “ὑπερξεπέπληκτο” used to express Astyages’ joy and amazement at his grandson’s prowess. Implicit in this part of the narrative is the clash of cultures and attitudes between Media and Persia. Astyages takes great pride in his grandson’s achievements, whereas Cambyses is worried by the reports of his son’s precocity.

ἔργα ἀνδρὸς ἥδη διαπραττόμενον: Cyrus is accomplishing what are classed as man’s deeds by Cambyses and the Persian state, at the tender age of sixteen, eleven years before he would have been expected to join the *teleioi andres* in Persia (1.2.12). Hence his father’s desire to get his son back to adhere to the rigid educational system.

τὰ ... ἐπιχώρια: ‘The customs of his own country’. In this instance it refers not just to the necessity of Cyrus rejoining the Persian *paideia*, but of also regaining familiarity with all the *nomoi* of his native land, before his time in Media can render him a complete stranger to the Persian way of life.

μὴ ... ἡ πόλις μέμφοιτο: ‘lest the state blamed [him]’. The accountability of the Persian royal family to the state has already been spelled out to Cyrus by his mother Mandane (1.3.18), and several years later Cambyses will remind him of the dangers of him ruling his native land without the approval of the Persian elders and leaders (8.5.24 - cf. Xenophon’s description of the accountability of the Spartan kings to the Ephors and the state in the *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia* (*Lac.* 15.7 ff.). Xenophon notes that the honours, *timai*, bestowed on a Spartan king are not much greater than those of ordinary, *idiōtikoi*, citizens).

ἐλπίδας ἔχων μεγάλας ... : Astyages’ ‘great hopes’ are justly founded on Cyrus’ pre-eminence over his Persian and Median contemporaries and his displays of a natural aptitude for leadership and warfare. The various obligations involved in family ties and loyalty to friends would have been familiar to Xenophon’s readership as a standard part of Greek morality (e.g. Hes. *Op.* 327 ff. & 709 ff.).

φίλους ὠφελεῖν καὶ ἐχθροὺς ἀνιᾶν: In chapters 3 and 4 of the *Cyropaedia* the relationship between Astyages and Cyrus has been based on mutual obligations. Astyages has now fulfilled his obligations in giving Cyrus the time and facilities to learn from and experience the freedom of the Median court. He clearly expects further conflict with the Assyrians and realises that an adult Cyrus would be an invaluable ally at such times and that Cyrus would feel obliged to respond to any summons that came from Media (see Rapp 1988, 42 ff. and Synopsis to chapter 5 for a discussion of the theme of helping friends and enemies; see also Gera 1993, 122 n. for examples of this theme in Xenophon's other works). Xenophon lists, as one of the many qualities of Cyrus the Younger, his devotion to helping friends and harming enemies (*An.* 1.9.11 ff.).

26. Cyrus' redistribution of presents given to him by Astyages goes against the traditions of Median hospitality and has repercussions at the Median court. It surprises his Median friends, who return the presents to Astyages, presumably in fear of the reaction of their king on seeing them with items which were intended for Cyrus, and thus brings him indirectly into conflict with his grandfather. Cyrus has the final word in this episode, just as he has done in previous misunderstandings between grandfather and grandson (e.g. in the banquet scene in the previous chapter). Astyages sends the gifts to Persia but Cyrus has the nerve to return them once more with the message that his friends should be allowed to keep the gifts, otherwise he would be too ashamed to ever return to Media. In the earlier verbal exchanges between the child and the old man (1.3.4 ff., 1.4.10 ff.), Xenophon draws attention to what is implicit in Cyrus' words - the politeness and eagerness to please mask a determination and confidence in the justness of his own cause. Cyrus, the young boy, is the focus and driving force of the conversations and Astyages, the powerful king, is portrayed in contrast as merely the artless respondent. The Persian prince's response on this occasion is consistent with the depiction of the previous exchanges. Behind the succinct and courteous message of Cyrus on this occasion lies the threat that he will not return to Media and fulfil his grandfather's high expectations of him. Cyrus appeals to Astyages' sense of shame, successfully arguing that the slight Astyages feels in having his expensive gifts treated

in an apparently cavalier way, would be nothing compared with the shame Cyrus would feel in not being able to ensure that his friends kept the gifts. The same combination of politeness and menace is later used to telling effect in the letter he sends in answer to the angry threats of his humiliated ally Cyaxares following the defection of the Medes to his camp (4.5.27 ff.).

πολλὰ δὲ δῶρα διαδοῦναι φασιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἡλικιώταις: Cyrus chooses his departure from Media to make one last gesture of *philanthrōpia* (see Synopsis).

στολὴν τὴν Μηδικὴν ἐκδύντα δοῦναι τινι ... ὃν μάλιστα ἡσπάζετο: Cyrus' removal of his Median robe is a symbolic demonstration of his return to his native land and to the austerity of the Persian *paideia*. The robe represents the opulence of Median life and Cyrus decides to shed it like a skin to prepare for the return to his old way of life and to avoid criticism from the Persians for wearing what are regarded as effeminate and over-elaborate clothes (a similar motive prompts his refusal of the gorgeous robe sent to him by Cyaxares for the purpose of meeting an embassy from the Median king (2.4.1 ff.); Cyrus does not wish to offend the Persian army or to give Cyaxares the satisfaction of seeing him conform to the Mede's idea of correct protocol). The recipient of this gift is the Mede, Araspas, who later reappears and is then introduced into the narrative as a boyhood friend who had been given Cyrus' robe (5.1.2). Araspas goes on to play an important part in the *Cyropaedia*, first as the guardian of Panthea (5.1.3), then as a spy sent to the enemy camp (6.1.31 ff. - see Tatum 1989, 165 ff. for an analysis of Araspas' role in the work). Neither Araspas or Cyrus' Median admirer, Artabazus, is named at this point in the narrative. Tatum correctly points out that both men are only named at the point at which they begin to play their respective roles in the story of Panthea, which can be assumed to be their proper role in the narrative (Tatum 1989, 175 ff.). Thus Xenophon's decision to name or not to name a character is a means of conferring narrative importance or pure functionality upon a character depending on the context of that particular passage. The same method can be detected in his decision not to name Cyaxares on the first three occasions that he is mentioned in the narrative (1.3.12, 1.4.5

& 1.4.6), and similarly with his introduction of the character of Panthea (4.6.11 & 5.1.2 ff.).

27-28. Εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ παιδικοῦ λόγου ἐπιμνησθῆναι ... : For a discussion of this episode see Appendix B.

Chapter 5

Synopsis

Cyrus' return from Persia results in his being put back into the class of *paides* for one more year (1.5.1), which, in terms of his own personal advancement, is a retrograde step. His manly deeds in Media, in hunting ferocious beasts and in fighting against the Assyrians, are of no account in determining his status in the Persian educational system; indeed, he has to convince his contemporaries that he has not succumbed to the luxurious Median customs. Cyrus successfully removes any suspicions about having become an effeminate Mede by openly embracing his former lifestyle with enthusiasm. Xenophon does not comment here on the genuineness of Cyrus' renewed zeal for the Persian *paideia*. The true extent of Astyages' and the Medes' influence over him is only revealed when he is safely in power in Babylon and he adopts the outward appearance and the despotic style of Median kingship (8.1.40 ff. & 8.3.1 ff.).¹ At this early point in his career he has to hide his satisfaction with his former existence at the Median court in order to win over his Persian contemporaries and elders, whose joking about him learning to live a life of ease amongst the Medes contains more than a grain of truth.

The rest of Cyrus' Persian education, as he proceeds into the class of youths, is summarised by Xenophon. He devotes his energies to the prescribed activities of his education with the same competitive spirit and single-mindedness that enabled him to master the equestrian skills of Median warfare and now enables him to regain his pre-eminence among the Persians of his generation. Xenophon then takes the narrative forward another eleven years to provide the background to the beginning of Cyrus' adult *paideia*, where he will put the lessons he learnt in childhood to good use whilst continuing to absorb new ideas and knowledge as part of the educative process of life. Meanwhile Astyages has died and Cyaxares has succeeded to the Median throne only to find his authority threatened by the Assyrian king, who is forming a coalition of

¹ See Gera 1993, 285 ff. on Cyrus' apparent transformation into a Median style ruler.

subject peoples and powerful allies in order to invade and subjugate Media (1.5.2-3). Cyaxares petitions the Persians for help in the hope that Cyrus will be sent with an army to bolster his own forces (1.5.4). His nephew is duly appointed as a commander by the Persian elders and raises an army to go on the expedition (1.5.5). Cyrus then consults the gods and, having obtained favourable omens, addresses the men who have been selected for the expedition from the class of 'peers', *homotimoi*, (1.5.6).

His first formal speech in the *Cyropaedia* is an exhortation to the peers to outdo the deeds of their ancestors and also a justification of their role defending the Persians and Medes against the aggression of the Assyrians (1.5.7-14). In the course of the speech he praises the loyalty of the peers to the Persian *polis* (1.5.8), but then proceeds to demonstrate, by drawing various analogies taken from everyday life, how the ancestors of the Persians did not take full advantage of their rigorous and virtuous lifestyle and acquire the material benefits they deserved for themselves and subsequent generations (1.5.8-10). Cyrus is determined that his generation of Persians will not suffer the same fate but will take full advantage of their overwhelming moral and physical superiority over the enemy to defeat them (1.5.11-12). He points out that the Assyrians are acting as the aggressors and therefore they are justified in taking up arms to defend themselves and their friends, the Medes (1.5.13). Cyrus concludes his speech by reassuring the peers that he has observed all the religious formalities and announcing that he will go on ahead of them to Media in order to make preparations for their arrival (1.5.14).

Chapter 5 of Book 1 is notable for its introduction to the narrative of the peers, the *homotimoi*, the class of men who have undergone the *paideia* described in chapter 2 of Book 1 up to the stage of being classed as *teleioi andres*, and who are chosen to be the 'officer class' of Cyrus' army. Cyrus has an inner clique of two hundred personally selected peers, who in turn select another four peers each - presumably drawn from all the twelve Persian tribes and geographical areas of Persia, but Xenophon does not choose to elaborate on this matter. The corps of a 1,000 peers in turn select thirty men from the uneducated commoners, *dēmotai*, from three classes of light infantry. Thus the composition of the Persian army, which is later discussed by Cyaxares and

Cyrus in Book 2 (2.1.1-10), highlights the hierarchical and apparently bipartite structure of Xenophon's depiction of Persian society, with a small educated élite controlling the majority of the uneducated and poor people.²

There are various historical counterparts from the Greek and Near Eastern worlds, that could have provided the inspiration for Xenophon's Persian 'peers'. In the minds of his Greek audience the most obvious model for them would have been the Spartan 'equals', *homoioi*, the select band of Spartan citizens who formed the core of a famed Spartan infantry. The equality of the *homoioi* in terms of their birth, upbringing and status was reflected in the military sphere by uniformity of equipment, training and roles they played in warfare.³ By the time of the composition of the *Cyropaedia*, another potential source of inspiration for Xenophon existed in the Greek world. The Spartan army had been eclipsed by the Theban forces under the inspired generalship of Epaminondas, who provided the new models for military excellence, with the 'Sacred Band' of warriors and the phalanx system of infantry warfare. The fourth century saw the widespread emergence of dedicated training for armies of the Greek *poleis* in order to create élite corps of infantrymen,⁴ so the subsequent narrative of the *Cyropaedia* which deals with the re-organisation and training of Cyrus' infantry-based army would have been very topical.

Greek history had shown how the development of hoplite warfare gave men the potential to overthrow aristocratic control of society, in other words how changes in the military status of the population could result in political and social change.⁵ In the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus knows that if his ambitions are to be fulfilled and he is to gain a power-base independently of his father, he must have the initial support of the peers, who can be used to help him win over the commoners. The eventual expansion of the

² See Tuplin 1990, 18 f. on the numbers and composition of the *homotimoi*.

³ As stated by Lazenby 1985, 74.

⁴ Hornblower 1983, 164 f.; see 1.6.43 for references to the phalanx in the *Cyropaedia*.

⁵ See Salmon 1977, 84-101 on the political implications of hoplite warfare.

élite force of Persian infantry is depicted as being part of the process of irrevocable change in the status and power of the Persian people and their ruler. He offers the commoners the same arms and by implication the same rights as the peers, thus providing a counter-force to any future opposition to his rule from the peers.⁶

It would be wrong, however, to consider the 'peers' purely in terms of Greek military models. In Greek eyes the most obvious Near Eastern model for the peers was the 10,000 Immortals described by Herodotus as accompanying Xerxes on his expedition to Greece (Hdt. 7.83), who took part in the increasingly desperate assault on Leonidas and his forces at Thermopylae (Hdt. 7.211). The Immortals were all Persian and infantrymen and were renowned for the opulence of their dress;⁷ within this 10,000 there existed a select 1,000 who guarded the king and were distinguished by their golden apples for spear butts.⁸ Frye suggests that the 10,000 were originally followers of Darius.⁹ Xenophon possibly has the Immortals in mind when he describes how Cyrus, having installed himself in Babylon, sets up a personal bodyguard of eunuchs (7.5.58-65), but considers this insufficient to guard against all his potential enemies; he accordingly selects 10,000 spearmen, from the ranks of the Persians, the people whom he considers would most welcome living under him in the opulence of his Babylonian palace, whilst proving to be most the loyal and incorruptible because of their shared nationality (7.5.68). The spearmen guard his palace night and day when he is living there, and, when he travels anywhere they accompany him, drawn up in rank beside him.

There are other clues to Xenophon's description of Cyrus' army to be found in

⁶ On the "egalitarian effect of uniform equipment" see Cartledge 1977, 27, "Indeed, if we can give a concrete sense to the self-styled Spartan 'homoioi' (peers), it is to the uniformity of their hoplite equipment and training, not to the equality of their property nor even their shared way of life as a whole, that we should primarily look." In a footnote to this sentence Cartledge cites the *Cyropaedia* (2.1.14-17) in support of his argument.

⁷ Cf. Curtius Rufus' account of the Persian forces of Darius III and of the gold and jewels which adorned the Immortals (Curt. 3.3.13).

⁸ According to Cook 1983, 101.

⁹ Frye 1976, 116.

evidence from the Near East, namely the military terms used in Persian inscriptions at Persepolis. These inscriptions date from the reign of Darius, founder of the Achaemenid dynasty.¹⁰ They refer to two classes of men within the *kāra*, the ranks of Persians capable of bearing arms in war; the *marīka*, the body of the young warriors who provided the backbone of the Persian army, and the *amušiya*, who acted as inner circle around the ruler. The *marīka* had an important role to play in Persian warfare, but it is not clear whether they had any other functions in Persian society. The *amušiya* were probably drawn from the nobility and acted as “chief men around the ‘chief’”,¹¹ presumably both in wartime and in peace. It is possible that Xenophon, with his own specialised knowledge of the Persians, knew of the existence of these two special classes of Persians, whose origins stretched far back in Iranian history, and adapted them to his needs in the *Cyropaedia*. The class of ‘youths’, who divide their time between honing their military skills, hunting and garrison duty and are at the disposal of the state for warfare or any other duties are comparable with the historical *marīka*. Similarly, the inner clique of 200 personally selected adult peers in Cyrus’ army resemble the *amušiya*. Thus Xenophon’s depiction of the class of peers, who provide the inspiration for the remodelled Persian infantry, is, like his *paideia* of chapter 2, a hybrid of the finest Greek and Persian influences, in this instance military classes known to his readers: the hoplites of the Spartan *homoioi* and Theban Sacred Band, and the Persian Immortals, but is also possibly traceable to his knowledge of the earliest, most basic, military divisions of the Persians.

Tuplin believes that after Book 7 of the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon has lost interest in the peers.¹² In Book 8 it is *entimoi*, ‘men of high rank’ or ‘nobles’, not *homotimoi*, who are described as forming the basis of Cyrus’ court (8.1.6 & 8.1.8). The *homotimoi* are not mentioned in Book 8 in connection with Cyrus’ court, and Xenophon focuses all his interest on the king’s specially selected entourage of nobles. However, the

¹⁰ See Frye 1972, 86 f.

¹¹ Frye 1972, 87.

¹² Tuplin 1990, 19.

disappearance of the *homotimoi* from Cyrus' court in Babylon may not be simply attributable to the author losing interest in them, but in Xenophon signalling in a subtle manner the deliberate marginalisation of traditional institutions of the Persians in Babylon. Once he has defeated the Assyrians and based his empire in Babylon, Cyrus finds that he is able to dispense with the Persian military conventions, by forming his own bodyguard of eunuchs (7.5.58 ff.), and most notably when the role of the peers in his inner circle is diminished by his withdrawal from regular and open contact with them into his own palace surrounded by an armed bodyguard (7.5.57 ff.). This diminution of the peers' status is presented and discussed by Cyrus and the peers in the purely practical terms of Cyrus needing rest and relaxation, and being unable to hold court for all those who wish to see him. Their decision to support his withdrawal from his army and court without considering its full implications, reflects a gradual historical shift in the Persian empire, in both its army and government, away from old feudal ties towards a more bureaucratic structure, where the Persian nobility, exemplified in the *Cyropaedia* by the peers, "was no doubt beginning to lose its dominant position".¹³ Although he may profess to uphold the principles of the Persian *paideia* (7.5.85), Cyrus' ultimate goal is to weaken the status, both militarily and socially, of the class of peers, who by virtue of their age and education would expect to play a key role in the future government of his empire. He chooses to reward individuals rather than particular classes of his society (8.2.2 ff), and promotes individual rivalry amongst his nobles to ensure his own security (8.2.26-27).

The composition of the army reflects the conventions of Near Eastern warfare, with its reliance on skirmishing tactics using lightly-armed troops - both the Median and the Assyrian armies have the same combination of light infantry and cavalry, without any heavily armed infantry (2.1.6). The peers themselves act as heavy infantry, as they can afford to equip themselves accordingly, having made the transition from light arms to heavy arms for fighting at close quarters, τὰ ἀγχιμάχα ὄπλα, on reaching the 'adult' stage of their *paideia* (1.2.13), whereas the commoners lack the resources to equip themselves

¹³ See Cook 1983, 53.

with more than light arms such as bows and slings. The end result of this initial selection process is a hand-picked army which divides neatly into three classes of light infantry numbering 30,000 with a heavily armed infantry of 1,000 at its core. The division of Cyrus' army in multiples of 1,000 conforms with Herodotus' description of Xerxes' army; and inscriptions from Persepolis confirm that the Persian army was built up in multiples of ten.¹⁴ The tripartite division of the army into different classes of soldier is also in accordance with Herodotus' account of how the Median army was reorganised in the seventh century (Hdt. 1.103). Herodotus states that the historical Cyaxares of Media was the first ruler to organise an army of Asia into companies, and the first to separate the different soldiers into their constituent parts, namely spearmen, archers and horsemen, when previously they had been mixed together in one confused mass.

Once Cyrus has assembled his army he has to inspire its commanders for the forthcoming struggle with the Assyrians. The circumstances surrounding his first formal speech in the *Cyropaedia* give it the appearance of a *cohortatio*, or *paraenesis*, a rallying cry, to the select band of peers who will accompany him on his expedition to Media. However, it has none of the spontaneity and urgency that one would expect in such a situation (cf. the impassioned *cohortatio* of the Assyrian king in Book 3 (3.3.44-45)). His first speech is therefore not presented as a plea for support; it serves instead as an appeal to those Persian values that he and the peers uphold and as a reminder of the collective strength of the Persian peers engendered by their education. A similar approach can be found in the formal speeches of Xenophon to the commanders and troops of the Ten Thousand in Book 3 of the *Anabasis* (*An.* 3.1.15 ff., 3.1.35 ff. & 3.2.8 ff), when he represents himself as trying to persuade and motivate his men through reasoned argument rather than impassioned oratory. Xenophon gives the young Persian prince a carefully structured deliberative address to the *homotimoi* selected for the expedition, who act almost as confidants to thoughts that have been weighed in his mind for some time.

The speech is deliberately stylised in tone and content to give the appearance of

¹⁴ Cook 1983, 101 f.

a formal piece of rhetoric - a passage from the speech earns the praise of Longinus, author of the treatise *On the Sublime* (Longin. 28.3 - see 1.5.12). Tatum refers to it as “an exemplary specimen of hortatory rhetoric”, whilst drawing attention to “the studied artificiality” of the *proemium* that is not characteristic of the later speeches given by Cyrus.¹⁵ Although he admires the elegance of Cyrus’ first speech, Tatum regards it as being smug in its assumption of Persian superiority, and facile in its caricature of the enemy. He then compares it with Cyrus’ later speeches addressed to his generals which are carefully staged and meticulously planned, and finds Cyrus in his first speech lacking in self-knowledge in the way that he avoids a realistic appraisal of the enemy’s strengths. “Cyrus’s speech is idealistic and quite uncontaminated by practical observation or preparation for actual battle”.¹⁶ Tatum’s assessment of the speech, however, does not take into account its actual purpose. Behind the hortatory rhetoric for the forthcoming war against the Assyrians, Cyrus is subtly introducing radical ideas. He is in effect asking the peers to prepare for the changes he wishes to make to the army in order to increase its effectiveness and to increase his own control of it. To achieve these goals he will need their support, but at this early stage he prudently softens the impact of the announcement of his plans by concealing them in standard rhetorical phrases and expressions of rhetoric. The exigencies of the situation dictate that he should adopt a chauvinistic tone against the enemy and express absolute confidence in Persian superiority, but his ultimate ambitions for the Persians are implicit within these trite sentiments.

Cyrus’ first speech acts as a justification for his *philotimia*, the restless force that will lead him to go far beyond his initial remit of defending the Persian and Median realms and to reorganise his army completely, usurp Cyaxares’ role as overall commander of the Persian and Median forces, and eventually make himself master of the whole Near East. Since he cannot reveal the full extent of his ambitions to the peers whilst he is still in Persia, under the watchful eye of his father and the *archai* of the *polis*,

¹⁵ Tatum 1989, 83 f.

¹⁶ Tatum *ibid.*

he has to hint at the scope of his plans here rather than explicitly state them. He does not deceive the peers as to his intentions, although deception of one's own troops is sometimes regarded by Xenophon as a necessary expedient (e.g. the speech of Clearchus in the *Anabasis* that convinces his mutinous troops that Cyrus the Younger does not plan to fight the Persian king (*An.* 1.3.3 ff.), and Agesilaus' deliberate concealment of the news of Peisander's death from his troops in the *Hellenica*, because he considers his men were the 'kind of men who would willingly share in good fortune if it happened, but if they saw or heard something unpleasant they were under no compulsion to share in it' (*HG* 4.3.13)). Cyrus' speech thus amounts to, on the one hand, a propaganda exercise for the Persian peers, on the other, a veiled apology for his future actions.¹⁷

There are two identifiable themes or *topoi*, in Cyrus' first speech: first, the failure of a people to realise their potential and assert the prowess that is theirs by the goodness of their nature and their education, in any sphere of life, is both wrong and morally indefensible; secondly, a war undertaken in self-defence is both right and morally defensible. Xenophon depicts Cyrus applying both themes to the context of the current situation of the *Cyropaedia*, where two rulers are seeking to expand their dominions, the Assyrian king through naked aggression, Cyrus by using the opportunity of an Assyrian invasion to put into practice his *philotimia* and so enhance the power of the Persians.

The first *topos* is addressed at the beginning of the speech, when Cyrus implies, without actually mentioning the Assyrians, that the Persians are in danger of being conquered, along with the Medes, because the lack of ambition of previous generations has led a powerful enemy, the Assyrian king, to think of them as being vulnerable to invasion. Such reasoning may be contrasted with the argument advanced by the

¹⁷ Cf. a passage in T.E. Lawrence's *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, where he is probably referring to the Cyrus of the *Anabasis* but his words could equally apply to the *Cyropaedia*. Lawrence looks to Xenophon for inspiration when pondering strategy for the Arab Revolt; he divides the elements of war into three factors: algebraic, biological and psychological, "There remained the psychological element to build up into an apt shape. I went to Xenophon and stole, to name it, his word *diathetics*, which had been the art of Cyrus before he struck. Of this our 'propaganda' was the stained and ignoble offspring." (Lawrence 1935, 195).

Assyrian king to his allies (1.5.3), that both the Medes and the Persians were powerful nations who pose a threat to the other peoples of the Near East. Both men play on the fears of their respective audiences to win them over to their sides. In view of the imbalance in manpower and resources between the two sides revealed by Cyaxares when Cyrus arrives in Media (2.1.2 ff.), Cyrus' argument is clearly more credible than that of his enemy. He looks at the history of the Persian people in a critical light, regarding the stunted growth and development of their power as having been caused by a lack of ambition and foresight on the part of their ancestors. We may compare Thucydides' critical revision of Greek history in Book 1 of his work, in particular his comments on the weakness of the early Greeks lying in their inability to make common cause in any military expeditions (Thuc. 1.3.). Cyrus uses this first speech not to criticise the actual training of the Persian *homotimoi*, but the purpose, or rather lack of any, to which their *paideia* has been directed. The real attack is directed against the customs of his predecessors who created "τὸ Περσῶν κοινόν".

Cyrus begins his speech by damning the ancestors, *progonoi*, of the Persians with very faint praise (1.5.8), and then speaks in general terms of how men do not fulfil their potential, using appropriate analogies to illustrate his point. The opinion Cyrus expresses may seem radical, but the way in which he does so is not. There are precedents in speeches in Greek literature for the appropriation of the past by a leader, and for the use of an emotive subject like the memory of one's ancestors to serve as a justification for a course of action he is proposing to undertake. A counterpoint to Cyrus' dismissal of his ancestors can be found in Thucydides' account of Pericles' funeral oration (Thuc. 2.36 ff.). Pericles begins by mentioning the deeds of his immediate ancestors in accordance with the convention of such occasions, but brushes them aside to give more praise to the previous generation, before moving on to a lengthy exposition of the virtues of contemporary Athens. A contrasting approach can be found in one of the speeches of Xerxes in Herodotus (Hdt. 7.50), where the actions of the Persian *progonoi* are used by the Persian king as the inspiration for the impending conquest of Greece and to refute the arguments of his uncle Artabanus against undertaking an expedition against the Greeks. The forefathers Xerxes refers to are men

of the recent past, the men of Cyrus' generation and of Cambyses and Darius' reign whose military prowess formed the Persian empire. In the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus has no illustrious forebears to refer to, hence his belittling of his predecessors.

It is worth reiterating that Cyrus' *philotimia* drives him to improve the standing of the Persians by forcing them to reappraise the deeds of their ancestors. Cyrus says that the rewards for those who practise military skills are great, *olbos*, *eudaimonia* and *timē*, for themselves and their *polis* (1.5.9). In order to reinforce his case he cites the analogies of the "γεωργὸς ἀγαθός" who fails to harvest his crop (1.5.10 - see 1.6.11 for agricultural metaphors in the *Cyropaedia*), and the athlete who trains to win but refuses to compete. He exhorts his peers, "μὴ πάθωμεν ταῦτα", referring not just to the previous analogies but also to the mistakes of his *progonoi*. The parallels between the analogies and his predecessors' lack of achievement, mentioned at the beginning of the speech, are thus made obvious. Although Cyrus tactfully refrains from making explicit comparisons, his message is clear: the emphasis on *enkrateia* and the hardships which form the basis of the Persian *paideia* are only worth enduring if they bring some tangible benefits to those who practise these ideals. Cyrus has seen his grandfather Astyages and the Medes enjoying wealth, happiness and honour without having undergone rigorous training and he sees no reason why he and his army should not enjoy the same benefits, without sinking into the hedonism, vulgarity and effeminacy characteristic of the Medes.

He speaks in the same terms after the first victory over the Assyrians when he realises that the Persians need cavalry such as the Medes and Hyrcanians possess, not just to pick up booty after a battle but also to become a formidable fighting force,

Ὅτι μὲν, ὦ ἄνδρες φίλοι, εἰ κατάσχοιμεν τὰ νῦν προφαινόμενα, μεγάλα μὲν ἂν ἅπασι Πέρσῃσι ἀγαθὰ γένοιτο, μέγιστα δ' ἂν εἰκότως ἡμῖν δι' ὧν πράττεται, πάντες οἶμαι γινώσκομεν· ὅπως δ' ἂν αὐτῶν ἡμεῖς κύριοι γιγνοίμεθα, μὴ αὐτάρκεις ὄντες κτήσασθαι αὐτά, εἰ μὴ ἔσται οἰκεῖον ἱππικὸν Πέρσῃσι, τοῦτο ἐγὼ οὐκέτι ὀρώ. *Cyr.* 4.3.4

Friends, I think we all recognise that if we could seize the rich pickings which now appear before us, there would be many benefits for all the Persians, and, of course, particularly for us by whom they are acquired. But I have yet to see how we can have a right to them, seeing that we are incapable of getting them through our own efforts, unless the Persians have their own cavalry.

The second *topos* of Cyrus' speech - the justness of the Persian cause against the

Assyrians - is used by Cyrus to prepare his troops for war and to encourage them to realise their full military potential; it also serves to conceal the full extent of his ambitions in the forthcoming war (see above). He can point to the fact that the enemy are the aggressors, “οἱ πολέμιοι ἄρχοντες ἀδίκων χειρῶν”, and that the Persians are going to aid friends (1.5.13). Furthermore, the Persians are physically and morally superior to their enemies (and to their allies the Medes - see 1.6.8 and Synopsis to Chapter 3), so Cyrus implies that they have a duty to assert their superiority by not only defeating their enemies in battle but also by continuing to be sovereign over them. In his speech Cyrus signals his espousal of *pleonexia* not just for the defeat of the enemy but also for the subjugation in his definition of what constitute virtuous deeds, “ἔργα ἀρετῆς” (1.5.8). The Persian *progonoi* had practised virtue simply to preserve their own goodness, whereas he concludes that *aretē* is practised by good people simply in order to have more, *pleon echein*, than the bad. *Pleonexia* is accordingly a ‘noble task’ for noble men.

Due regards this speech as indicative of a new moral attitude to war and military expansion in the fourth century,¹⁸ an attitude which is more complex than opinions expressed by figures such as Callicles in Plato’s *Gorgias* (*Grg.* 483A ff.) and speakers in Thucydides’ work, notably the Athenians in the ‘Melian dialogue’ (Thuc. 5.84 ff.). She cites Isocrates’ *On the Peace* as an example of this change in Greek sentiment and argues that, “the problems concerning the moral or immoral character of founding or exerting the power of an empire do not arise in the *Cyropaedia*, precisely because in the main part of the work Xenophon chooses to describe Cyrus’ wars as belonging together as parts of the same defence-action ... Cyrus’ Empire is thus the result of a just war”.¹⁹ Such an approach over-simplifies Xenophon’s approach to his portrayal of Cyrus and the nature of his power. Cyrus’ empire is not just the product of a just war against the Assyrians, but is also the result of his re-organisation of his own army and his appropriation of Cyaxares’ sovereignty over the Medes, a deed which is carried out by

¹⁸ Due 1989, 157 ff.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

stealth not by force.²⁰ Although the problems of the morality of power are never explicitly mentioned in the *Cyropaedia*, they inform Cyrus' words and deeds in a speech that implies that the Persians' moral superiority entitles them to subjugate the neighbouring peoples of the Near East. Furthermore, Cyrus' own moral superiority, allied to his birth and education, entitles him to assert his superiority over his own people. Throughout the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon is more concerned with how Cyrus subjugates his own people than the enemy peoples and the speech in chapter 5 of Book 1 is presented as the first step in this process of exerting control over his own people. Cyrus has to proceed cautiously, concealing his ambitions with unoriginal, but clever, arguments and building up his support among the army in order to make them accept and welcome his autocratic rule. He has already learnt how his grandfather Astyages employed *pleonexia* on his own subjects to maintain his despotic kingship (see Synopsis to chapter 3), and he will later discuss the acceptability of using *pleonexia* on his enemies in warfare (see Synopsis and Commentary to chapter 6). In this speech he combines the notions of civic and military forms of *pleonexia* to signal his intention of creating a vast empire, with him at its head.

²⁰ As Machiavelli realised - see Appendix D, n. 30.

1. ἐν τοῖς παισίν: The age limit for entrance into the class of youths is 16 or 17 (1.2.8) and Cyrus has still another year to go, which serves as a reminder of Cyrus' youth and precocity during the Median hunting expeditions and his involvement in the skirmish with the Assyrian prince.

εἰ ποτε ἐν ἑορτῇ εὐωχία γένοιτο ... : Cyrus avoids any displays of 'Median' gluttony at feasts, and gives away his part of his food instead (see 1.3.7 and Synopses to chapters 3 and 4 on Cyrus' distribution of food and his *philanthrōpia*).

αἰδούμενος τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καὶ πειθόμενος τοῖς ἀρχουσι: The Persian custom of respect for elders is mentioned by Cyrus in his final speech (8.7.10 - see Appendix C).

2. ὁ μὲν Ἀστυάγης ... ἀποθνήσκει: The date and manner of death of the historical Astyages are shrouded in mystery. It is clear from Near Eastern and Greek sources that he was the last ruler of the empire of the Medes, and that the reign of Cyaxares, his successor in the *Cyropaedia*, is an invention on Xenophon's part (See Appendix B). Herodotus' account of the Persian rebellion against the Medes emphasises the humanity and clemency of Cyrus, because the leader of the Persians, having usurped Astyages' throne, spared his grandfather's life and allowed him to spend his final years peacefully (Hdt. 1.130). Similarly, Photius' account of Ctesias' *Persika* also has Astyages surviving the siege of Ecbatana and Cyrus allowing him to live on peacefully (*FrGH* 688 F9). A different version of the fate of Astyages is presented in Isocrates' Evagoras, where Cyrus is compared unfavourably with the Cyprian king. Both kings gained power against all the odds, though Evagoras succeeded by acting piously and justly, whereas Cyrus committed some crimes, including the killing of his mother's father (*Ev.* 38). Isocrates is the only source who implicates Cyrus in the death of Astyages, and may have done so purely for the purposes of his *encomium* of Evagoras. The realities of Near Eastern warfare would point to Cyrus, on capturing Astyages in Ecbatana, ensuring that his grandfather did not remain alive to act as potential figurehead for any future rebellion (cf. the probable historical fate of Croesus). The ancient conflicting

literary traditions surrounding Croesus' death are summarised by How and Wells, who assume that Croesus survived the fall of Sardis (How & Wells, I, 1912, 98 f.). The consensus of modern opinion is that Croesus died in the fall of Sardis, either killed by the Persians or by his own hand (as Lehmann-Haupt 1929, 123-127 argues). Fehling traces the Herodotean account of the miraculous escape of Croesus from the pyre to Bacchylides' third ode, and argues convincingly that Bacchylides' public knew the true fate of the Lydian king (Fehling 1989, 206 f.).

‘Ο δὲ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων βασιλεὺς κατεστραμμένος ... : Xenophon shows how the Assyrian king builds his support through force and bribery, in contrast with Cyrus' efforts to secure, whenever possible, the willing obedience of his subjects and allies. The Assyrian king remains anonymous, a measure of his relative unimportance to the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* (see 1.4.26 on Xenophon's use of anonymity during the work), but he is given a speech of exhortation to his troops before the first battle (3.3.44-45). After the battle he is mentioned as having been killed, his death causing great consternation in the ranks of his army (4.1.8 & 4.2.3). Gobryas, a former friend of the king, later refers to him as a ‘good man’ and contrasts him favourably with his evil son (4.6.2).

Σύρους ... τὸν Ἀραβίων βασιλέα [κτλ.]: All the peoples mentioned here as having been subdued by the Assyrian king, and those who are approached to form an alliance against the Medes and Persians, are to be found in the list of subject peoples of Cyrus' empire in Book 1 (1.1.4). When Cyaxares lists the different contingents of the Assyrian army to Cyrus (2.1.5), he mentions the peoples outlined here, apart from the Syrians. The Median king also mentions ‘the Greeks who live in Asia’ as possibly being recruited to the Assyrian cause, although there is no further mention of Greeks fighting against Cyrus, until Croesus becomes leader of the combined forces against Cyrus and compels the Greeks in Asia, who are under his rule to join his army (7.2.9).

ἰσχυρότατον γὰρ τῶν ἐγγύς φύλων τοῦτο ἐδόκει εἶναι: The power of the Assyrian king has already been described; now it is the turn of the Medes. At the start of the narrative of

the *Cyropaedia*, despite their reputation for effeminacy and love of luxury, the Medes have the finest cavalry in the Near East (see 1.6.10), and can count on the Armenians as a vassal people who pay tribute to them, Astyages having defeated them in war (3.1.10).

3. Κροῖσον τὸν Λυδῶν βασιλέα: Croesus makes his first appearance in the *Cyropaedia*. His importance in the *Cyropaedia* lies in his role as the one adult to whom Cyrus turns for advice, following the capture of Sardis (7.2.10; cf. Hdt. 1.88, where Croesus advises Cyrus to stop his soldiers indiscriminately sacking the city). The Lydian king plays a less prominent role in the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* than he does in Herodotus' work, but Xenophon preserves the same features of the initially arrogant and deluded character sketched by Herodotus (on the encounter between Croesus and Cyrus in Book 7 of the *Cyropaedia* see Lefèvre 1971, 282-296 & Tatum 1989, 146-159). Herodotus' Croesus counsels his conqueror unprompted, whereas Xenophon shows the Lydian king as being deliberately obsequious and anxious to please Cyrus. Croesus is mentioned as bringing a substantial force of 10,000 horsemen and over 40,000 archers and peltasts to the Assyrian side (2.2.5). When he becomes a captive of Cyrus, he relates how the Assyrian king had persuaded him to take the field against the Medes and the Persians (7.2.22 ff.). Xenophon portrays him as taking an active role in the first battle with Cyrus, fighting on the ramparts of the Assyrian camp alongside the Assyrian king in order to prevent the initial defeat becoming a rout (3.3.68). After the death of the Assyrian king he joins the general flight from the camp (4.1.8), and evades the pursuit by Cyrus (4.2.29-30). Croesus then reappears in the narrative as Cyrus' enemies regroup to fight him again, this time as the leader of an alliance even larger than the first one formed by the late Assyrian king (6.2.9 ff.).

διαβάλλων πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μήδους καὶ Πέρσας: The Medes are regarded by the Assyrian king as the most powerful of the neighbouring peoples, and once they are conquered he assumes that he will be able to increase his control over the Near East (1.5.2). This is not the first instance of Assyrian aggression against the Medes, as Cyaxares mentions

in passing to Cyrus (2.1.5), but it is clearly intended to be more than a border skirmish in view of the preparations made by the Assyrian king. He tries to form a coalition consisting of rulers of vassal states and powerful kings, such as Croesus of Lydia and the king of India, in order to accomplish his goal, persuading them of the potential threat posed by the Medes in alliance with their kinsfolk the Persians. In doing so he sets in train a course of events which will lead to his death and the downfall of Assyrian power. This version of events has no historical basis; other sources, both Greek and Near Eastern, describe an armed revolt by Persia against Media (see Roux, G. 1992, 383 ff. on the historical evidence for the Persian uprising against Media). The inscriptions of the Assyro-Babylonian king, Nabonidus, show that he acted as the catalyst for the Persian revolt, by seeking an alliance with the Persians in order to recover the city of Harran from Median control (Roux, G. *ibid.*). Thus the Babylonians were allies in Cyrus' campaign to destroy Median hegemony over the Near East (a later Greek source, Diodorus Siculus, comments on Babylonian support for Cyrus (D. S. 9.23)).

4. Κυαξάρης ... εἰς Πέρσας ἔπεμπε ... : Faced with the Assyrian threat to his kingdom, Cyaxares makes immediate preparations to counter an invasion, but is not confident of the Medes' ability to withstand a combined force of the size being gathered by his enemies. He is driven to do precisely what has already happened according to the Assyrian king: he makes common cause with the Medes' kinsmen, the Persians. He sends out an appeal to the Persians on three levels; to the state, *to koinon*, and to the king Cambyses, for an army, and to the now adult Cyrus to come as a leader of this army. Xenophon implies that Cyaxares does not automatically assume that he will receive any aid from the Persian state. Such is the isolated, introverted nature of the Persian state, that the involvement of the king and state in a war outside their own borders would be a major, almost unprecedented step. The Median king's appeal to Cyrus himself is far more of a formality, because Cyrus is indebted to the Medes, having benefited from Astyages' hospitality for three to four years and having been groomed to help the Medes and harm their enemies (1.4.25). As a child Cyrus had demonstrated his leadership qualities and martial prowess in Media, and Cyaxares is right to assume

that his eagerness to prove himself has not diminished in the intervening ten years.

Xenophon alludes to past military co-operation between the Medes and the Persians elsewhere in the *Cyropaedia*. When Cyrus arrives in Media with his army he tells Cyaxares that he has brought 30,000 lightly-armed infantrymen, the type of troops who had in the past served the Medes as mercenaries, “οἱ καὶ πρόσθεν ἐφοίτων πρὸς ὑμᾶς μισθοφόροι” (2.1.2 - Xenophon also refers in the *Cyropaedia* to Persians and Medes serving in other armies, but these are men who had been enslaved and forced to join the armies of the Assyrians, Syrians and Arabians (4.5.56)). Cyrus himself refers to his own troops as *misthophoroi* when he offers them the choice of adopting heavy armour and of having a stake in the future successes of the army, or of remaining as mercenaries (2.1.19). Xenophon implies that the *dēmotai* who have joined Cyrus’ army have not done so out of devotion to their *polis* but simply for the opportunity of receiving pay and plunder; it is Cyrus’ task to inspire in them devotion for himself, not the Persian *polis*, and the first step in this process is to offer them new weaponry.

τὸ κοινόν: ‘The Persian state’. When Cyrus sends to Persia for reinforcements he commands his messenger to ask the Persians what portion of the spoils of battle should be sent to them (4.5.17). His father, Cambyses, should be approached for guidance as to what is due to the gods, and the *archai* should be asked what portion of booty the Persian *koinon* requires. Cyaxares recognises that when dealing with the constitutional monarchy of the Persians, already outlined (1.2.15), one must not only petition the king for aid, but also the citizens. The Median king’s wish that Cyrus should command the army is dependent on the compliance of the Persian state, “εἰ τινας πέμποι στρατιώτας τὸ Περσῶν κοινόν”.

It is not until later in the *Cyropaedia* that some clues to the workings of its constituent parts are given (8.5.21 ff.), when the conquering hero Cyrus finally returns home to Persia. He brings with him gifts for the three classes of adult citizens who have undergone the Persian *paideia*, described in Book 1 (1.2.13-14); namely the men who occupy what can be termed the leading offices or magistracies of the state, *archai*, drawn from the class of adult men, the elders, *geraiteroi*, and the peers. Cyrus is

greeted by his father, who summons the elders, and the foremost of the officers of the state, “τὰς ἀρχὰς οἵπερ τῶν μεγίστων κύριοι” (8.5.22), to listen to his speech addressed to Cyrus, defining the role of the monarch and Persian state in the new, enlarged Persian dominions. It is probable that Xenophon conceives the same select group of elders and leading magistrates as representing the Persian state, to which Cyaxares directed his appeal in chapter 5 of Book 1; and that he assumes that a larger gathering of elders, and all the magistrates, or all the peers, would have been unsuitable for such an overture. Cambyses’ speech to both son and state in Book 8 is used by Xenophon to counterpoint the speech of Cyrus to the peers at Book 1 and to highlight the differing approaches of father and son to the role of monarch. Cambyses recalls the great opportunity given to the Persian prince by the state when it allowed him to take an army to help the Medes, and his words serve both as a reminder that Cambyses remains king of the Persians until his death and as a warning to Cyrus not to abuse the power he has won for himself and harm the Persian people (Tatum 1989, 77).

ὁ Κῦρος διατετελεκὼς τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἐφήβοις δέκα ἔτη: Cyrus is now approximately 27 years old and is considered to be old enough to bear proper arms in war.

5. πελταστὰς ... σφενδονήτας ... τοξότας: Cyrus later refers to his commoner troops as consisting of archers and spearmen, “τοξόται καὶ ἀκοντισταὶ” (2.1.16), the spearmen presumably including the *peltasts* referred to here, although this discrepancy in military terms is an example of Xenophon not always being consistent in his terminology. After he has captured Sardis, Cyrus takes with him Lydian soldiers for the siege of Babylon. Only those men who are willing to serve him are allowed to keep their horses, arms and chariots; those who are not, have their weapons burned, and their horses are turned over to the Persians. The recalcitrant Lydians are made to follow him, armed only with slings, σφενδόναι (7.4.14), and all those Lydians who do not carry weapons are also made to practise with a sling,

νομίζων τοῦτο τὸ ὄπλον δουλικώτατον εἶναι. Σὺν μὲν γὰρ ἄλλῃ δυνάμει μάλα ἔστιν ἔνθα ἰσχυρῶς ὠφελοῦσι σφενδονῆται παρόντες, αὐτοὶ δὲ καθ’ αὐτοὺς οὐδ’ ἂν οἱ πάντες σφενδονῆται μείνειαν πάνυ ὀλίγους ὁμόσε ἰόντας σὺν

ὄπλοις ἀγχεμάχοις. *Cyr.* 7.4.15

He [Cyrus] considered this weapon to be the most appropriate for a slave. Even though the presence of slingers with other forces can, on occasion, be extremely useful, on their own, not all the slingers in the world could resist a few men with heavy weapons.

6. ἤρξατο πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν: Cyrus' piety is emphasised, by his regular observance of religious ritual and seeking of divine favour (see 1.6.1; see also Due 1989, 156 on Cyrus' piety). At this point in the narrative he is making offerings to the gods for a favourable outcome to the war with the Assyrians, and he later assures the peers that he has not forgotten to consult the gods before the expedition takes place (1.5.14).

7. Ἄνδρες φίλοι: Cyrus begins his speech by creating a rapport between himself and his audience, which leads him to talk on the theme of *paideia*. He greets the peers as friends and equals, and as men whom he has observed since childhood, “ἐκ παίδων”. The stress he places on the longevity and the strength of the bond between himself and peers is intended to highlight the benefits of the communal experience of the Persian *paideia*, but conveniently ignores the four to five year hiatus in Cyrus' education and the subsequent efforts he had to make to regain the respect of his contemporaries after his time in Media (1.5.1). He addresses them with the same words of favour in Book 2 when raising the possibility of the commoners carrying the same arms as the peers (2.1.11), but when he speaks to the commoners for the first time he reverts to the more formal “Ἄνδρες Πέρσαι” (2.1.15). Thereafter he addresses the whole army together as ‘*andres philoi*’ (2.3.2), and does not employ any distinction in his use of greetings to men, using a variety of terms. This even-handed approach reflects his aim to unify his army, and not to discriminate openly in favour of anyone on account of his status and education, but only because the person in question has merited such favour through his actions and loyalty to Cyrus (e.g. 3.3.59 where the peers use ‘*andres philoi*’ and ‘*andres agathoi*’ to spur their men on to battle with the Assyrians).

προθύμως ταῦτα ἐκπονοῦντας: The use of ἐκπονεῖν maintains the emphasis on the benefits of the Persian *paideia* and the notion of constantly striving to carry out what the Persian state considers to be good. This labour for the good of *to koinon* is not done under

duress but is carried out eagerly, “προθύμως”.

οὐκ ἄκων εἰς τὸδε τὸ τέλος κατέστην: Cyrus is more than happy to accept the responsibility of commander of the Persian army and the opportunity to further his personal ambitions, whilst also serving the cause of defending the Persian *polis*.

8. Ἐγὼ γὰρ κατενόησα: The main part of the speech is presented as being the result of Cyrus’ deliberations (cf. the beginning of the *Cyropaedia* where the author himself starts the work with reflections on the temporary nature of human power “Ἐννοιά ποθ’ ἡμῖν ἐγένετο” (see 1.1.1)).

οἱ πρόγονοι χεῖρονες ἡμῶν οὐδεν ἐγένοντο: Cyrus’ description of the forefathers of the Persians as being ‘in no way worse than us’, marks the beginning of his guarded but devastating criticism of the Persian state. He proceeds to qualify that statement by implying that, in his opinion, the ancestors of the Persians were also no better than his contemporaries, and therefore were not necessarily the best models to follow. Such sentiments would have been particularly startling to a Greek audience, who normally treated their ancestors as a source of inspiration. The theme of revering and trying to emulate the deeds of one’s *progonoi* figures prominently in the orations of Isocrates (e.g. *On the Peace*, where he criticises the current generation of Athenians for being inferior to their ancestors because of their reliance on mercenary troops (*De Pac.* 47); the *Panegyricus*, where the history of Athens and the Athenian *progonoi* are glorified at length (*Pan.* 28 ff.).

Xenophon himself uses the idea of ancestors’ deeds as an inspiration in the *Memorabilia*, when Socrates tells Pericles’ son that the Athenians can recover their former glory and *aretē*, by following the example of their illustrious *progonoi* (*Mem.* 3.5.14). He also depicts a situation in the *Anabasis* analogous in some respects to this one in the *Cyropaedia*, where he himself uses the example of the Greek forefathers who defeated Xerxes’ invasion force to inspire an assembly of soldiers about to undertake a hazardous journey home (*An.* 3.2.11 ff.). There are only three further references to

forefathers in the *Cyropaedia* and each one is made by a king who is about to be or has been superseded by Cyrus: Cambyses (1.6.31), Cyaxares (5.5.8) and Croesus (7.2.24).

ἀσκοῦντες: The theme of practising and training is introduced, here in the context of the Persian forefathers striving, as Cyrus has mentioned the peers doing in the *proemium*, to do all that the *polis* considers to be right and avoiding all that is considered to be wrong. Cyrus questions the end to which their labours were directed. He shows that they were simply maintaining the *status quo*, rather than extending the power and material benefits that should have been accruing to the Persian *polis*. The verb *askein* occurs throughout the speech. Having introduced the athletic metaphor, Cyrus refers to the peers as “ἀσκηταὶ ... τῶν καλῶν ἔργων” (1.5.11).

ἔργα ἀρετῆς: Cyrus seeks to redefine what constitutes “ἔργα ἀρετῆς” for his army, and in doing so he is prepared to give the ancestors of the Persians all the credit they deserve for leading virtuous lives, but he cannot, and will not, praise them for not having put their virtue and continence towards furthering the interests of the Persian nation. He, in contrast, is intent on securing political and material benefits for his people and above all for himself and his army.

9. τῶν παραυτίκα ἡδονῶν: The reference to immediate pleasures and abstaining from them evokes the hedonistic lifestyle of the Medes, which Cyrus himself has experienced in his childhood. As an adult, Cyrus has a sterner outlook on life and will not be deflected from his major goal of attaining an empire. This abstinence from enjoying the fruits of his victory until it is complete leads him to refuse to join in Cyaxares’ drunken carousing after the initial success over the Assyrians (4.1.10 ff.). He is unimpressed by his uncle’s argument that it is better to enjoy the smaller, immediate pleasures in life than to pursue something bigger and better and run the risk of losing everything (see Introduction D (iii) on Cyaxares’ speech).

οἱ τε αὖ τὰ πολεμικὰ ἀσκοῦντες: Cyrus speaks as a former student of the art of warfare

(see 1.6.12).

10. καρπὸν ... γεωργὸς ἀγαθός: See 1.6.11 on farming metaphors in the *Cyropaedia*. Xenophon describes the link between Persian kings and *geōrgia* in the *Oeconomicus* (*Oec.* 4.2.4 - see Pomeroy 1994, 237 ff. for a valuable discussion on the subject of the 'gardener-king' in Near Eastern sources and in particular of the Persian king's personal role in ensuring the successful cultivation of his lands).

ἀσυγκόμιστον ... ἀθλητῆς ... ἀξιόνικος ... ἀναγώνιστος: Cyrus employs the rhetorical device of assonance to make his speech have even more impact. The contests that take place in the athletics ground provide a convenient parallel for the forthcoming military contest against the Assyrians, whom he later says are not 'strong combatants', "οὐ ... οὗτοι ἱκανοὶ εἰσιν ἀγωνισταί" (1.5.11). Cyrus' approach towards his audience is reminiscent of the arguments employed by Xenophon's Socrates in the *Memorabilia*, when he chides Charmides for refusing to speak in the Assembly and to involve himself in state business, (*Mem.* 3.7.1 ff). Socrates introduces the hypothetical examples of the great athlete who refuses to compete in the games and to win honour for himself and his homeland and the capable politician who avoids matters of state, to show how wrong and absurd their behaviour is. When Cyrus speaks of students of oratory who do not study for their own benefit but in order to persuade others and benefit mankind, and of students of the art of war who do so not out of love for fighting but for their advancement of themselves and their own people, his words clearly refer to himself and are therefore meant to carry even greater weight with his audience.

The use of *ιδιώτης*, the opposite of *ἀσκητής*, continues the athletic *agōn* metaphor introduced earlier in the speech, the word being used here in the sense of untrained opponent ('amateur' has somewhat anachronistic and, in this context, inappropriate connotations). Cyrus is not so foolhardy as to believe that the giant army of the Assyrian king will be so easy to defeat as he is implying. He acknowledges in this part of the speech that the enemy are skilled in the use of the bow and spear and in the art of horsemanship. He also realises that the peers themselves could be viewed as

idiōtai, having had no experience of actual warfare, unlike himself, and he must reassure them in the speech, by concentrating on the deficiencies of the enemy and strengths of the peers. His belief is that that the Persians will triumph despite their inexperience, and that whatever the size of his opponent's army, it will be vulnerable to a quick, decisive thrust from troops who are willing to fight at close quarters. The subsequent military encounters in the *Cyropaedia* serve to confirm the optimistic confidence displayed here by Cyrus. The Assyrians and their allies prove to be incapable of withstanding the discipline and ferocity of Cyrus' forces; only the Egyptians display courage and skill against them (7.1.32 ff.).

The contrast between the trained athlete and the unskilled citizen is also brought out in Xenophon's *Hieron*, when the Sicilian tyrant cites the *athlēēs* who takes no pleasure in defeating an *idiōēs*, but is angered when he is defeated by another *athlēēs* as an analogy for the tyrant who finds no satisfaction in being wealthier than his citizens, but is jealous of the superior wealth of a rival tyrant (*Hier.* 4.6).

11. τοὺς πολεμίους, οὓς ἐγὼ σαφῶς ἐπίσταμαι αὐτοὺς ἰδὼν ἰδιώτας ὄντας: In a speech designed to fire the spirits of the peers for the forthcoming conflict, Cyrus deliberately denigrates the enemy, leading Tatum to describe his speech as presenting a caricature of the enemy. However, his remarks are not without substance, in view of his own, albeit brief, experience of fighting the Assyrians; hence his confident use of “σαφῶς ἐπίσταμαι”. This early encounter with the Assyrians (1.4.18 ff.) - when he described the Assyrian horsemen as “πονηροί” (1.4.19), and his lack of respect for the enemy enabled him to inspire the Medes to a hazardous but crushing victory over them - informs his comments over ten years later and leads him to describe them as *idiōtai*, unskilled and untrained opponents. The analogy is continued as Cyrus contrasts the enemy's lack of training in enduring the *ponoi* associated with warfare, including the ability to function with the minimum of sleep, with the *homotimoi* being trained in physical endurance as a result of their hunting sessions in their youth (1.2.10 ff.). The Persians are used to hunting on foot (see 1.2.9) - unlike their enemies who hunt on horseback and rely on beaters to flush out the game into the open for them - and are therefore accustomed to

starting out early in the day to make the maximum use of daylight (cf. *Cyn.* 6.13) and to keep going all day and night if necessary. Cyrus then confidently proclaims that the peers are able to use night as effectively as day (1.5.12). When he reveals his hunting stratagem for capturing the Armenian king, he warns his commanders not to be overzealous in their preparations and to deny their men sufficient rest. His friend and loyal subordinate Chrysantas is mentioned in this connection as a man who has often gone the whole night without sleeping, such is his love for hunting, *philothēria* (2.4.26).

ἀπαίδευτοι δὲ ὡς χρὴ καὶ συμμάχοις καὶ πολεμίοις χρῆσθαι ... : Cyrus leaves one of the most important weaknesses of the enemy until the end of the speech, they are untrained, “ἀπαίδευτοι”. Moreover, they are untrained in the art of *pleonexia* in warfare, which, as Cyrus and his father later discuss (see Synopsis and commentary to chapter 6, 1.6.28 ff.), involves the careful distinction between correct treatment of one’s friends and enemies and the ability to deceive and use stratagems on one’s enemies. The Persian prince’s words echo not only Astyages’ heartfelt hope when he takes his final leave of his grandson (see - 1.4.25), a hope which will be realised when Cyrus eventually returns to Media.

12. Ὑμεῖς δὲ νυκτὶ ... : Cyrus has just commended the peers’ ability to use night as others would day. His father later emphasises to him the necessity of thinking of the needs of his army during both night and day (1.6.42). The same ability is also attributed by Xenophon to *Agesilaus* (*Ages.* 6.6), and Jason of Pherae (*HG* 6.1.15).

πόνους δὲ τοῦ ζῆν ἡδέως ἡγεμόνας νομίζετε: Longinus in his *On the Sublime* cites this phrase as being a particular fine example of *periphrasis* (Longin. 28.3).

λιμῷ δὲ ὅσα περ ὀψῷ διαχρῆσθε: Xenophon offers a variation on the Greek metaphor associating τὸ ὄψον with hunger and hard work. The Persian *paideia* teaches its young men to endure hunger, which in turn renders their simple food rations pleasurable

(1.5.12). Cyrus later asks the Medes to supply his army simply with bread, and not with meat or wine, as hunger is their relish and they can drink from the river, “ὄψον μὲν τὸν λιμόν, πιεῖν δ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ παραρρέοντος ποταμοῦ” (4.5.4). In the *Memorabilia* Socrates is commended for his control of his appetite (*Mem.* 1.3.5).

ὕδροποσίαν δὲ ῥῆον τῶν λεόντων φέρετε: During their education the Persians are used to quenching their thirst with water drawn from the river (1.2.9) and Cyrus enforces this custom in his army (see above). Herodotus notes that the Persians venerate rivers and do not allow anyone to pollute them (Hdt. 1.137). The image of a lion quenching its thirst occurs in a simile in Book 16 of the *Iliad*, when the fighting between Patroclus and Hector - which ends in the death of the former - is likened to the struggle between a lion and a boar over a small mountain spring, both animals being spurred on by their desire to drink (*Il.* 16.823 ff.).

κάλλιστον δὲ πάντων καὶ πολεμικώτατον κτῆμα ... ἐπαινούμενοι γὰρ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασι χαίρετε: It is the physical, as well as the mental, benefits of the Persian *paideia* which Cyrus says will give the Persians the advantage over the enemy. He produces a maxim that shows that whatever the Persians lack in military experience is made up for in their superior ability to endure hardship and deprivation. The same argument appears in the *Anabasis* when Xenophon tells his fellow Greek soldiers that they can engage the Persians in battle with confidence because they have bodies which can endure cold, heat and hard work better than the enemy. Moreover, their physical superiority is reflected in their moral superiority, provided they enjoy the aid of the gods,

ἔτι δ’ ἔχομεν σώματα ἱκανώτερα τούτων καὶ ψύχη καὶ θάληνη καὶ πόνους φέρειν· ἔχομεν δὲ καὶ ψυχὰς σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς ἀμείνονας. *An.* 3.1.23

Moreover we have bodies more able than theirs to bear the cold and the heat and physical exercise; and we also have, with the help of the gods, better souls.

Xenophon's Cyrus concentrates on one particular aspect of the souls of the peers, making a stirring appeal to the martial instinct to strive for glory on the battlefield which is present in them, and which, by implication, is absent in their enemies: they are lovers of praise, “ἐπαίνου ἐραστάς”. Cyrus regards this trait as the best and most warlike

“κτῆμα” of all, which makes men willingly undergo hardship and danger. Xenophon evokes the aristocratic and martial spirit of Homeric heroes, who were motivated by a desire to win glory, κλέος ἀρέσθαι, when writing about Cyrus’ efforts to motivate the Persian peers. Such spirit is not wholly confined to the Greek world; according to Herodotus, the most manly virtue for the Persians is to fight well on the battlefield (Hdt. 1.136). As a soldier from the higher ranks of Athenian society, Xenophon would have understood this intrinsic motivation of men trained in the art of warfare, the striving for praise from one’s equals and contemporaries. The same sentiment informs his comment in the *Memorabilia*, ‘that praise is the sweetest of all things to hear’ (*Mem.* 2.1.31). He would also have understood the dictum of Isocrates, namely that men are far more willing to listen to praise than advice (*Ep.* 2.1 & 9.6). The whole of Cyrus’ first speech is full of praise for the qualities of the peers at the expense of the enemy, whilst affirming that the speaker, Cyrus, is the right man to bestow such praise on them and to lead to them on the expedition. At the same time it also warns of the future efforts and dangers in store in order for the new generation of warriors to fulfil the dormant potential of the Persian nation.

There is a subtle difference of approach when Cyrus later makes a similar speech to the rest of the Persian army, offering them new arms and the chance to become a part of his new restructured army (2.1.15 ff.). He offers them too, the chance to earn glory but does not confine himself to promising them something as immaterial as praise. He adopts a more pragmatic approach, and offers them ‘an equal share’ in the dangers that lie ahead and of the success should they do some deed worthy of a *kalos kagathos*, a formula which neatly covers both praise and material spoils (Rapp 1988, 40).

13. ἐμᾶντὸν ἐξαπατῶ: ‘I deceive myself utterly’. The irony of the statement lies in Cyrus concealing the true extent of his ambitions from the peers (see Synopsis).

πιστεύω τοι τῇ πείρᾳ ... μὴ ψεύσειν με ταύτας τὰς ἀγαθὰς ἐλπίδας: Cyrus allows himself one more rhetorical flourish. Not only does his trust in his own experience of the peers mean that he is not deceived, ψεύδειν, by his high hopes; he also contrasts his confidence in the

peers with his lack of regard for the enemy.

οἱ πολέμιοι ἄρχοντες ἀδίκων χειρῶν ... : Cyrus is careful to appeal to the Persian instinct for administering justice and to stress that they are embarking on a just war (see Synopsis). The Persians can think of themselves as “ἐπίκουροι”, an auxiliary army for the Medes - as opposed to those commoners who have previously served the Medes as mercenaries, *misthophoroi* (2.1.2 - see above 1.5.4). Cyrus’ true intentions are completely different, but he is not prepared to reveal them to the peers at this stage nor indeed at any stage in his campaigns. Each decision he makes to increase his own and Persian power and to continue fighting is presented as a natural reaction to events and is taken with the approval of his army. Alcibiades’ dictum, recorded by Thucydides (Thuc. 6.18), that all empires are won by peoples coming to the aid of those allies who ask for it, is well illustrated in the *Cyropaedia* by Cyrus’ usurping of Median power.

14. The speech ends with Cyrus reminding his audience of his piety, the final quality that fits him for the task he has been appointed, but which is equally as important as his other leadership qualities. We may compare Xenophon’s own piety which he demonstrates when leading the Ten Thousand in the *Anabasis*; and Diogenes Laertius’ biography of Xenophon mentions his piety, his fondness for sacrificing and augury, “εὐσεβῆς τε καὶ φιλοθύτης καὶ ἱερεῖα διαγνῶναι ἱκανός” (D. L. 2.56; see Dillery 1995, 179 ff. for an analysis of Xenophon’s religious views, in particular his traditional piety and his belief that the gods could punish men for their impiety, which is reflected in his comments in the *Hellenica* on the reasons for the defeat of the Spartans at Leuctra (HG 5.4.1)).

Chapter 6

Synopsis

The lengthy conversation involving Cambyses and Cyrus, as the father accompanies son to the Median border where destiny awaits the Persian prince is one of the most important and pivotal scenes in the work as a whole, where the didactic nature of the *Cyropaedia* appears most prominent in a scene modelled on earlier Greek and Near Eastern works of wisdom literature.¹ Gera concludes her excellent analysis of the whole scene, drawing parallels with works of the '*hypothēkai* genre' and Xenophon's Socratic works, by noting that,

Young Cyrus has already demonstrated his ability to hold his own with adult members of his family ... so that we might have expected him to be on more of an equal footing with his father here. None the less, Cyrus is the pupil, pure and simple, in our dialogue and this is the only time that we shall find the hero of the *Cyropaedia* cast in this role.²

The final statement is qualified by a footnote, acknowledging that the brief reappearance of Cambyses in chapter 5 of Book 8 (8.5.22-7) is another instance of Cyrus being subordinate to the authority of his father. Both statements in the conclusion are in need of further qualification, if one is to attempt a correct and coherent interpretation of chapter 6 of Book 1. The purpose of this analysis of the chapter is to examine the respective roles father and son play in this dialogue, in order to show that Cyrus is not simply the obedient pupil he is so often cast as being and that Cambyses' influence on his education is not as great as it first appears.³ As well as examining the structure and content of the scene, the Synopsis explores the nature of the relationship of Cambyses and Cyrus, to demonstrate that their conversation can be interpreted as straightforward didactic *oeuvre* but also as an attempt to show the clash in ambitions and ideals of father

¹ Gera 1993, 50-54.

² *Ibid.*, 72.

³ Tatum notes that Cyrus' obedience to Cambyses' wishes is part of a plan to humour his father; Tatum 1989, 87 f., "If there is any perceivable strategy in Cyrus's conduct with his father other than simple obedience, it is that he projects everywhere an awareness that his father must be taken seriously as a teacher".

and son which will be demonstrated once Cyrus leaves his homeland (see Appendix C for a comparison of this dialogue with the speech of parental advice given by Cyrus to his sons (8.7.6-28)).

In chapter 6 Xenophon puts forward theoretical solutions to the problems he has introduced at the start of the work concerning the transient nature of power and the seemingly intractable difficulties men face when ruling over other men (1.1.1 ff.). In discussing the methods for organising and securing the obedience of the Persian army, Cambyses and Cyrus are discussing principles of military leadership which are equally relevant to leadership of communities and *poleis* and professions which require leadership.⁴ In its structure and the wide range of topics covered, the conversation between Cambyses and Cyrus contains elements found in Socratic dialogues, wisdom literature, and military treatises.⁵ It also acts as an exposition of the leadership problems Cyrus will encounter and solve in the narrative, foreshadowing the events and recurring themes of his military and administrative career.⁶

The particularly didactic nature of this part of the *Cyropaedia* ensures that the content of the dialogue is subordinated to Xenophon's need to convey the practical and ethical lessons contained within it to the Greek audience. He makes little attempt to maintain any Near Eastern authenticity - the character of the whole scene is transparently Greek, as is the behaviour of its protagonists. Xenophon could be accused of carelessness for depicting Cyrus mentioning the quintessential Greek hero Heracles (1.6.27) and his father referring to Greek educational practices (1.6.32), and, above all, for introducing the idea of Cyrus approaching his father for money to pay a teacher of generalship, an idea which runs contrary to his description of the Persian ideal of a strictly-regulated *paideia* conducted in the interest of the state, away from the vulgarities of commerce (1.2.2 ff.).

⁴ Cf. Socrates' illustration of this point in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 3.4.1 ff.); see also Wood 1964, 33-66.

⁵ See Breitenbach 1966, 1721 ff.

⁶ See 8.1.14 on how Cyrus models the domestic affairs, τὰ οἰκονομικά, of his palace and empire according to the organisation of his army; see also Due 1989, 92 ff.

The striking resemblance to the Socratic dialogues portrayed in the *Memorabilia*, and the respective roles assigned to father and son in the conversation, relocate the two men in fifth century Greece rather than sixth century Persia. Cyrus may play the part of ideal student,⁷ but, as in all didactic literature, the audience are the real pupils for whom Cambyses' words of advice are intended. In order for the dialogue to have its intended educational effect Cyrus must be cast in the appropriate interlocutory role. Gera observes that there are three broad groups of interlocutors in the Socratic dialogues of the *Memorabilia*.⁸ The first group merely act as foils to Socrates, saying very little except to confirm his arguments and questions. The second are similarly non-contentious, but play a greater role in the dialogue, questioning Socrates, raising problems and being unafraid to assert their own personalities. The third group ranges from those who express opinions different from Socrates, and are capable of arguing and debating at length with him, to those who have a strong antipathy towards him and who actively seek verbal conflict with him. In this dialogue in the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus clearly belongs to the second group of interlocutors. He cannot adopt an eristic approach to the conversation and openly disagree with his father, and yet it is not in his nature, as the previous chapters have shown, to be demure and submissive when engaged in conversation with an elder. The author emphasises the idea that Cyrus is duty bound to play the role of obedient son and young man in this scene and in the rest of the *Cyropaedia*. During his initial time spent in Media he responds immediately to his father's summons home (1.4.25), even though he is reluctant to do so, as he is anxious to avoid offending not only his father but also the Persian *polis* that Cambyses rules. Similarly, when he returns as conquering hero to Persia, he is shown accepting without reservation his father's speech outlining his future role and the latter's right to continue to be king of the Persians (8.5.26). This public subordination is thus maintained in the private conversation of father and son.

The true nature, however, of the respective roles father and son play in this

⁷ As Tatum 1989, 88 suggests; see n. 3.

⁸ Gera 1993, 36 f.

dialogue cannot be simply explained in terms of a teacher lecturing his pupil, or father imparting the sum of his knowledge to his departing son. As the commentary on the chapter shows (see below), Xenophon does not entirely succeed in reconciling the two principal, and sometimes conflicting, aims of his presentation of the dialogue of 1.6: first, to provide a self-contained didactic ‘work within a work’, based around a conversation between father and son, and deriving its content from Socratic dialogues and wisdom literature (see Introduction A on the dual purpose of the *Cyropaedia*); secondly, to show the ideological clash between the conservatism of Cambyses and the impetuous ambition of his son, which will be realised after Cyrus enters Media. The dialogue can accordingly be interpreted as operating on two levels, according to the needs and perception of the audience.

On a purely didactic level, Xenophon shows Cyrus as the eager pupil, gladly accepting some sound advice on ethical conduct, logistics and military theory. Cambyses, as the wise and experienced father cum sage figure, is allowed, in the tradition of wisdom literature and Socratic dialogues, to correct some of his son’s naive and complacent assumptions on these subjects. The other level is also didactic but in a Machiavellian way; the dialogue works as a clever and subtle portrayal of how Cyrus is able to show complete self-control despite his father’s insistent questioning, and not divulge his true intentions. Xenophon shows that he is thinking beyond the internal logic of this dialogue and is hinting at Cyrus’ future ambitions and conduct, which will go far beyond anything his father envisages in chapter 6 of Book 1. Behind the overtly didactic nature of the dialogue there is another lesson to be learnt for the aspiring ruler, which is not to reveal all his plans at once and to show deference, not defiance, to his elders until he is a position to act independently. Cyrus will soon be displaying the same economy with the truth while undermining his uncle Cyaxares’ role as overall head of the Median and Persian armies, intervening in the disputes of the Medes with the Armenians and in turn with the conflict between the Armenians and Chaldaeans as a prelude to his acquisition of the Assyrian dominions.

The dialogue between Cambyses and Cyrus is deliberately juxtaposed with the latter’s speech to the peers (1.5.7-14), in order to highlight this ambiguity in its purpose

and meaning. To approach the dialogue on the purely didactic level, Xenophon presents it as the culmination of a series of private educational conversations they have had, presumably from the time Cyrus returned from Media, although there is no indication of precisely when they started or of their frequency, nor of whether these paternal 'tutorials' were a feature of Persian *paideia* for all youths and young men. The range of topics they have discussed, on matters relating to leadership in religion, morality and above all in military matters suggests that Cambyses was fulfilling the role of a king grooming his heir for the burdens of leadership in war and peace, burdens which, as Cyrus later reveals to his younger son Tanaoxares, are particularly onerous (8.7.11-12). Therefore Cyrus alone among his contemporaries undergoing the Persian *paideia*, in his position as prince and heir to the throne, would have had the benefit of these special sessions from his father. As a tutor, Cambyses is portrayed as being a strict and exacting, if somewhat pedantic taskmaster for his son, recalling former mistakes and carelessness of the young prince, who sees his role as passing on some of his kingly knowledge to his son as well as reinforcing the precepts taught to Cyrus during childhood.

In terms of structure the dialogue can be divided into the following sections: 1.6.1-6, the importance of sacrifice and omens and correct behaviour towards the gods is discussed; 1.6.7-11, a transitional passage in which the conversation shifts from the gods to the practicalities of the human world, and, with deliberate references to the observations of 1.1.1-2 the art of ruling over other men and its links with knowledge of *oikonomia* is discussed; 1.6.12-25, the techniques of military leadership are outlined, the underlying principles of which will influence the administration of Cyrus' empire; 1.6.26-43, Cambyses instructs his son in the art of using *pleonexia* to gain the upper hand over the enemy, showing how the principles employed in hunting can be used against enemies in warfare (the importance of correct conduct towards friends and enemies is also mentioned); 1.6.44-46, Cambyses returns to the subject of the gods and the unreliability of human wisdom, which must be supplemented by consultation with the gods. The device of having father and son asking questions of each other enables Xenophon to cover a wide range of topics, whilst repeating certain key values which he

feels to be essential and will inform Cyrus' approach to leadership, such as ensuring that his men are well nourished, well trained and obedient, learning to differentiate between friend and enemy, seeking to secure the love and obedience of the former and seeking to use cunning and guile against the latter.

Cambyses begins the conversation by reminding his son that he has taught him the art of divination so that he will not be at the mercy of soothsayers, who could deceive him if he was unable to interpret divine signs. He says that Cyrus must work with, but not rely on, soothsayers. Cyrus acknowledges this warning and recalls that his father once said that men who did not flatter the gods in times of need but who remembered them most of all when they were prosperous were more likely to have their prayers answered. He adds that the same principle also applied to dealings with one's friends (1.6.2-3). The pattern of the dialogue is accordingly set by Xenophon. Cyrus undergoes a kind of catechism set by Cambyses who seeks both to warn and to interrogate his son. Cyrus' replies show that he has listened to his father's advice by remembering instances of paternal wisdom, consisting of strictures of a universal nature relating to conduct towards the gods, which in turn are valid towards one's fellow mortals. The conversation now shifts from man's correct relationship with the gods to his correct relations with the rest of mankind (1.6.7). Xenophon returns to the issues raised at the beginning of the *Cyropaedia*, namely how to govern oneself, one's household and other people (see 1.1.1 ff.). Cyrus agrees with his father that it is indeed an admirable, *thaumaston*, task to govern well, "τὸ καλῶς ἄρχειν" (1.6.8), but then switches the emphasis of the conversation from universal wisdom to pointed criticism of specific rulers, in particular their ally, the present incumbent of the throne of Media. His father acts quickly to wrest the conversation away from a potentially awkward topic by pointing out that it is not just individual men but circumstances that have to be overcome.

Cambyses' reference to *pragmata* signals a shift in the conversation from the ethical to the practical and the beginning of what can be described as the 'technical' part of the conversation. There follows a general discussion covering various topics germane to the subject of good generalship, beginning with father and son underlining the

importance of keeping an army well-supplied, paid, and in good health; Cambyses also provides advice on where to choose a location for a camp (1.6.10-18). He reminds his son of the dangers of allowing idleness to creep into his ranks, with a suitably gnomic warning that if one idle man can be a burden, then an idle household is worse, and an idle army is worst of all. The next topic to be covered is securing the willing obedience of the troops, which involves the general actually being, not just appearing to be, wiser than those under him. Cambyses observes that people are more inclined to obey the man they think is wiser than themselves. Cyrus, therefore, must excel in all areas and show himself able to endure hardship better than those beneath him.

Having discussed matters pertaining to his own army Cyrus turns the conversation to defeating the enemy (1.6.26 ff.). Cambyses informs him that the lessons he learnt in deception whilst hunting will stand him in good stead when it comes to deceiving the enemy. Cyrus must learn to distinguish between friend and foe, and in the case of the latter, must be prepared to act towards them contrary to the strict moral code which he has been taught during his childhood. He has to deceive, take unfair advantage and harm fellow human beings, potentially dangerous ideas that are only introduced to young Persians when they are approaching manhood, as Cyrus is now, so as not to disrupt their carefully regimented educational system (1.6.34). Cambyses then supplies his son with practical suggestions on how to catch the enemy unawares and mislead them (1.6.36-40). To illuminate these suggestions he turns to hunting, Cyrus' favourite pastime, which provides a good physical and mental training in the arts of war, as the huntsman learns to get up at unseasonable hours and ambush prey (1.6.39-40). The similarities between this passage and the *Cynegeticus*, where Xenophon also emphasises the suitability of hunting as training for warfare (*Cyn.* 1.18), are obvious. The same idea is expressed in the two different works in different ways. In the *Cynegeticus* the author gives his reader advice directly, in the *Cyropaedia* the advice is imparted in a dramatic setting, the figure of Cambyses being used as a mouthpiece for Xenophon's ideas.

The 'practical' section closes with Cambyses mentioning the possibility of encountering the enemy in open battle without the opportunity to gain any advantage beforehand, the least desirable state of affairs for a general. He believes that if Cyrus

heeds the advice he has received his army will still have an advantage over his foes (1.6.41-2). There then follows a long rhetorical question in which Cambyses lists several practical organisational duties involved in commanding an army, which are linked by ὁπως ... ἢ ὁπως, such as drawing it up in battle array, pitching camp, dealing with unexpected enemy attacks and attacking fortified places (1.6.43). Xenophon does not elaborate on these themes in the manner of his 'technical treatises' on horsemanship, cavalry commanding and hunting; but the problems mentioned by Cambyses will all be encountered and dealt with by Cyrus in the military campaigns forming much of the later narrative of the *Cyropaedia*. Cambyses knows that Cyrus has already learnt what there is to know and must now put his learning into practice, so he has no need to speak any further on technical matters, "ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τί ἂν ἐγὼ λέγοιμι σοι;" (1.6.43).

The 'epilogue' of the conversation between father and son deals with ethical matters and returns to the importance of divine favour and heeding omens from the gods. Cyrus may have successfully negotiated his catechism, but Cambyses thinks that his son still needs reminding of certain ethical points and issues a direct command to Cyrus to learn from him the most important lesson of all, which is not to act contrary to omens and auspices (1.6.44). He goes on to imply that ignorance of divine messages presaging future events is echoed in men's ignorance of past experience, an area from which Cyrus would do well to learn (1.6.45). The importance of learning from past experience also has prophetic overtones, the circumstances surrounding Cambyses' remarks being used by Xenophon to foreshadow future events. Just as the repeated emphasis placed by Cyrus on co-operation between his sons Cambyses and Tanaoxares in governing his empire (8.7.24) foreshadows the internecine strife that follows his death (8.8.2), so Cambyses mentions unspecified instances where men and peoples have chosen the wrong course of action, including those who are persuaded to attack other peoples only to be destroyed themselves (1.6.45), and his words foreshadow the eventual defeat and subjugation of the Assyrian king and his allies.

Having started the final part of the conversation by talking of warring *poleis* Cambyses narrows down the scope and scale of the examples in his speech to men who mistreat others and pay the price, and men who lust for more power and wealth than is

their due and accordingly lose everything. Once again the technique of foreshadowing of future events in the narrative is used by Xenophon. The fate of two of Cyrus' foes, the Armenian king and Croesus, will provide suitable illustrations of Cambyses' advice. The former reneges on his treaty with the Medes when they are threatened with invasion, but is subsequently defeated by Cyrus and his bid for freedom leaves him more enslaved than ever (3.1.19). The latter is persuaded on two occasions by others to take arms against Cyrus and on both occasions is defeated, thus losing his city, wealth and power (7.2.20-23).

Cambyses ends his advice to his son by "returning" to the subject of the gods in order to contrast the ineffectiveness of human wisdom, "ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη σοφία", in selecting the right course of action, with the omniscience of the gods (1.6.46). Cambyses thus acknowledges the limits of human wisdom and shows deference to the superior knowledge of the gods. If Cyrus follows his ethical and practical advice he will win the favour of the gods, who can reveal to him things of which men have no knowledge. Cambyses has offered Cyrus the means to win divine approval, which he must not take for granted and which he will receive only if he follows his father's advice. This final idea in Cambyses' *paraenesis* (see Introduction D (iii)) is also articulated by Xenophon in the *Cynegeticus*,

ὥστε ὑπάρχειν ἐνθυμουμένους τούτων θεοφιλεῖς τ' εἶναι καὶ εὐσεβεῖς τοὺς νέους τοὺς ποιούντας ἃ ἐγὼ παραινῶ, οἰομένους ὑπὸ θεῶν τοῦ ὁρᾶσθαι ταῦτα.

Cyn. 13.17

So it will come to pass that the young men who do what I recommend and take these matters to heart, will be both beloved of the gods and pious men, knowing that one of the gods is watching their actions.

Cyrus does follow his father's advice and does receive favour from the gods, so that when it is his turn to impart wisdom to his sons he can honestly tell them that he has always received what he has wanted and fared as he had wished (8.7.6-7).

The exact nature of the relationship between father and son, and the extent to which Cyrus follows his advice is the key to the other level of interpretation of the dialogue as highlighting the different and conflicting aspirations of father and son (see Appendix C). The *Cyropaedia* deals with the self-education of Cyrus and his eagerness to seek out new experiences from which he can learn and practise his own techniques

of leadership and control. Cambyses' influence on his son's development has been crucially limited due to the young prince's lengthy and voluntary stay in Media. By the time Cyrus returns to Persia, having matured and educated himself beyond the limited scope of the Persian educational system, he is already pursuing his own path towards realising his own ambitions for himself and for the Persian people. He has already acquired sufficient knowledge to demonstrate to everyone that he has the necessary qualities in abundance to become a great general and a great king. Although he is content to be, and also to be seen to be, subordinate to his father whilst he remains in Persia, by the time of their dialogue in chapter 6 of Book 1 Cyrus realises that his father will soon be unable to exert any control over his plans or influence his decision-making. Whilst gratefully accepting practical suggestions and reiterations of Persian values from his father, Cyrus clearly relishes the prospect of leaving Persia with the expeditionary force and the virtual autonomy guaranteed by his position as its leader. By the time Cyrus has attained manhood the importance of Cambyses as a teacher is accordingly limited to highlighting, for the benefit of the audience, the range of skills his son already possesses. Cambyses' overall role in the *Cyropaedia* is less as a mentor to his son than as a reminder of the Persian way of life from which Cyrus moves away when founding his empire, although he still advocates its moral values as a means of holding on to and expanding Persian dominions (in his speech at 7.5.72 ff.).

Xenophon's limitation of Cambyses' role in the *Cyropaedia* assumes even more significance in view of his references to the strong family links that are present in Persian society during Cyrus' upbringing. The maintenance of these links comes before the promotion of the interests of the people as a whole, and ranks only second to the well-being of the gods. Xenophon begins his description of Cyrus' life and Persian customs by establishing the latter's divine ancestry through the *genos* of the Persidae (1.2.1), and notes that the existence of twelve ancestral Persian tribes has a bearing on the organization of the Persian *paideia* (1.2.5). Cyrus himself will sacrifice to the ancestral gods of Hestia Patrōia and Zeus Patrōios before leaving Persia (1.6.1). The commoner Pheraulas, who has risen through the ranks of Cyrus' army, describes his former life to his Sacian friend as being part of a close family unit headed by the father

who supported his family and in turn was supported by Pheraulas when the latter was old enough to do so (8.3.37). Cyrus himself acknowledges the value of family ties, when he prevails upon the Armenian king and his son to reconcile past differences after he has crushed the revolt of the king (3.1.38 ff.), but in doing so he is motivated by military expediency rather than any reverence for fatherhood.

The prominence of the family in the eyes of the Persians has to alter if Cyrus is to realise fully his own ambitions for a Persian army reorganised on meritocratic lines, that is committed to the foundation of an empire encompassing many peoples united through their fear and admiration of Persian might, embodied by the figure of the king (1.1.4-6). Cyrus redirects the existing family ties and feelings of reverence for the Persian forefathers, by using the egalitarianism and conformity encouraged by the Persian code of behaviour and *paideia*, to foster in the Persians a loyalty devoted predominantly to the new Persian state, with himself at its head. He then uses lavish and public displays of *philanthrōpia* to consolidate his position (see Synopses to chapters 3 & 4). His first speech to the peers with its candid reappraisal of the achievements of their forefathers (1.5.7-14) is the first step in this process of realigning Persian support around himself and his vision of a cosmopolitan empire. Cyrus' subsequent actions help to reconstitute the role of the Persian monarch as not simply head of the Persian *polis*, but also as a father to his people, initially to the men in his army and then to the people in his empire.⁹

As leader of his army the Persian prince exploits his role as the source of material and spiritual benefits for his soldiers - he is the interpreter of divine signs, the furnisher of new arms, money, provisions and booty, and above all the man who offers opportunities for them to acquire honour and respect - and thus becomes, despite his comparative youth, a father figure to his whole army.¹⁰ Xenophon portrays himself in a similar role in Book 7 of the *Anabasis*, when he is commander of the Ten Thousand

⁹ Cf. Hdt. 3.89 on Cyrus being regarded as a father to the Persian people; see Introduction D (v).

¹⁰ As the peer Chrysantas acknowledges in a speech to the other peers and leaders of the army 8.1.1 ff.

at the court of the Seuthes, the Thracian king. Seuthes refers to him as being a friend of the soldiers, “φιλοστρατιώτης” (*An.* 7.6.4). When he is called upon to defend himself for apparently choosing to enrich himself at Seuthes’ court rather than taking the army to join the Spartan expedition to Asia Minor, Xenophon reminds the soldiers of his former exertions on their behalf (*An.* 7.6.11 ff.). He refers back to the former dangers they experienced together, when they called him ‘father’ and promised to remember him as their benefactor, “οὐ μὴν ὅτε γε ἐν τοῖς ἀπόροις ἦμεν ... ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἐμὲ ἐκαλεῖτε καὶ αἰεὶ ὥς εὐεργέτου μεμνήσθαι ὑπισχνεῖσθε” (*An.* 7.6.38).

Once Cyrus has completed his main conquests and established himself in Babylon he continues to act as a benefactor to the Persians and his newly acquired peoples, creating a dependence on him as the guarantor of stability and peace and prosperity. Phaulas is thus able to comment that he used to live in his own home, but that now everything he possesses has been given to him by Cyrus (8.3.39). Xenophon describes Cyrus’ rule as being characterised by unique generosity to his subjects to the extent that the king supplants the immediate family in his adoring subjects’ affections,

Τίς δ’ ἄλλος λέγεται δώρων μεγέθει ποιεῖν αἰρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἀντ’ ἀδελφῶν καὶ ἀντὶ πατέρων καὶ παιδῶν; *Cyr.* 8.2.9

And of whom else is it said that through the magnificence of his gifts he [Cyrus] made himself preferable even to brothers, fathers and children?

Cyrus’ ambitions are still far from being fulfilled when his father passes on the gift of his own knowledge of the art of kingship, *basilikē technē*. Cambyses is portrayed in the dialogue as adhering to old Persian values of conservatism, and in doing so he acts unwittingly as a counterbalance to his son’s ambitions. Cyrus is careful not to articulate any of them in the course of the conversation, even though he is depicted as a lively conversational partner who is unafraid to respond to his father’s questions and promptings. The verbal exchanges between the two men are accordingly formal and polite but without any sense of intimacy between father and son as one might expect from a father saying farewell to his son and heir who is about to engage in a great and very dangerous undertaking in order to preserve the freedom of the Persians.

The gulf in the two men’s aspirations for the Persian people is highlighted when their conversation switches from correct conduct towards the gods to the practical

matters relating to ruling over other men (1.6.8 - see Commentary). Cyrus makes his one and only attempt to directly challenge his father, by abruptly yet surreptitiously directing their conversation away from generalised discussion to focus on their kinsmen and allies, the Medes. His trenchant criticism of their ruler and the Medes' apparent acceptance of his indolence and luxurious lifestyle is a clear signal of his intention to undermine and to end Cyaxares' kingship. Xenophon demonstrates, through Cambyses' refusal to acknowledge Cyrus' criticism, and through his eagerness to return to the general nature of their discussion, the crucial lack of harmony between father and son. Cambyses remains cautious, anxious to avert the threat of the Assyrians and to preserve the *status quo* of the Persian *polis*. Cyrus, on the other hand, is already planning how he can put his own educational experiences and military training into reorganising and rearming the army to fulfil the potential of the Persian people. When the two men subsequently discuss arrangements for the provisioning of the army, securing their obedience and motivating them, and finally methods of deceiving the enemy, Cambyses does so only with the immediate needs of Cyrus and his army fighting against the Assyrians in mind. Cyrus is looking to employ these methods against not just the Assyrians but also to subdue allies and subjugate subjects of his empire.

When his father is shown introducing what he regards as a new and potentially dangerous concept to Cyrus, the art of employing deception and *pleonexia* to defeat one's enemies (1.6.27 ff.), the improbability of the scene is obvious. Cyrus is already knowledgeable of the various ways of deceiving an enemy and he understands the importance of using hunting skills in the entrapment of an enemy, as he has already demonstrated during his hunting expeditions in Media and his first battle against the Assyrian hunting party (1.4.18 ff.). The Persians, as a consequence of the unjust behaviour of some of the teacher's pupils towards their friends, react by limiting the application of the cunning and deceit used in *pleonexia* towards enemies in warfare. The result is a stable, well-ordered society, but one that is also introspective and limited in its power. Cyrus is well aware that he can apply the methods he has learnt in hunting to not only take unfair advantage of enemies but also to enhance his own position and subjugate his allies (see discussion of *pleonexia* in Synopses to chapters 3 & 5).

Furthermore, Cambyses' decision to discuss a fundamental part of the skills of leadership for the first time at the very point when Cyrus is about to leave Persia, is clearly unrealistic unless one remembers that this is a didactic dialogue conceived for the instruction of the audience and with little thought for the requirements of maintaining a logical and credible train of events in the narrative.¹¹ Cambyses does not make any acknowledgement of Cyrus' existing knowledge in chapter 6 of the *Cyropaedia*, even though he does refer back to their previous conversations during this dialogue. His concentration on Cyrus' former mistakes leaves the impression that he is not fully aware of the extent of his son's development and is capable only of dealing with general lessons of military logistics and organization. Such lessons are important in themselves, but Cambyses does not illustrate them by drawing upon his own military experiences to give them extra relevance, which leads one to question the extent of his knowledge of warfare and the scale of the armies he has led. Although Cambyses is careful to establish that Cyrus will take adequate care of the provisions and health of his own army, Xenophon avoids giving him specific details to discuss, such as how Cyrus should best co-operate with the Median army, and he does not attempt analysis of the enemy's potential strengths and weaknesses for the benefit of his son - Cyrus must fend for himself in these matters, which he does, very successfully.

¹¹ Cf. Nestor's advice on horsemanship to his son Antilochus before the chariot race held as part of Patroclus' funeral games in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 23.304 ff.).

1. 'Εστία πατρώα καὶ Διὶ πατρώω καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς: Sacrifice before endangering himself and his army (1.6.44 - cf. *Oec.* 5.19, *Eq. Mag.* 3.1). Cyrus' piety is once again emphasised, every major undertaking in his career is preceded by prayer or sacrifice (Bizos 1971, I, 97 notes that this is one of the twelve occasions in the work where Cyrus or one of his men addresses prayers directly to the gods). The gods in this occasion are deliberately hellenised by Xenophon, Zeus corresponding to the Persian god Ahuramazda (see Cook 1983, 147 ff. & Gera 1993, 54-56), but there was no historical Persian equivalent to Hestia. Xenophon, in placing Hestia first at this point in the narrative, may be linking the Greek goddess of the hearth with the Persians' worship of fire as divine (see Hdt. 1.131; see also Gera 1993, 56 n.). Cyrus also offers sacrifices to ancestral Zeus when he returns to Persia to die (8.7.3 - see Appendix C), but on this occasion there is a certain irony in his sacrificing to the god of the ancestors whom he has so recently criticised (1.5.7 ff.).

λέγονται ἀστραπαὶ καὶ βρονταὶ ... γενέσθαι: Cyrus receives divine portents throughout the in all different kinds of forms (see Bizos 1971, I, 97); they are, however, consistent in their presaging something advantageous to Cyrus. On this occasion both Cambyses and his son are so confident in the good omens of thunder and lightning from Zeus that they decide not to take any more auspices. A thunderclap before the battle against Croesus is also taken by Cyrus as a favourable sign from Zeus (7.1.3; cf. Xenophon's account of the siege of the Median city of Mespila in the *Anabasis* during the Persian revolt, when the city falls to the Persians after Zeus sends a thunderstorm to terrify the Medes into submission (*An.* 3.4.12-13). Throughout the narrative the omens for the Persians are invariably good - hence Cyrus' claim that he has always received divine guidance in his life (8.7.3). Away from the fictional world of the *Cyropaedia*, Xenophon and his audience would have been aware that divine portents could sometimes presage misfortune (cf. Thucydides' account of how the retreating Athenian army in Sicily regard the summer thunder storms that occur during their march as omens of their own destruction (Thuc. 7.79)).

2. Ἐγὼ ... σε ... ἐδίδαξαμην: Xenophon makes it clear from the outset of Cambyses and Cyrus' dialogue that the father has taken a special role in Cyrus' *paideia*, in particular in ensuring that his son is taught how to interpret divine omens correctly. Such tuition is not mentioned earlier in the work as being part of the Persian educational system and presumably it was designed specifically for Cyrus as heir to the Persian throne, and, in this instance, as leader of the Persian army. The use of "ἐδίδαξαμην" is causative, to indicate that Cambyses had Cyrus taught by others (see 1.6.12 & 1.6.20), as well as his own paternal instruction. Xenophon's Persian kings resemble their historical Spartan counterparts in their role as military and religious head of their people, and when an army is on campaign they are responsible for sacrifice and religious observance amongst their army. This ability to understand the counsels of the gods is vitally important and should not be entrusted to anyone else; it is also symbolic of the close relationship between gods and kings when the latter claim divine ancestry. In the Greek world, where monarchy was in the minority, such a responsibility was not confined to kings but also to generals (e.g. *An.* 6.4.13 ff. & *Eq. Mag.* 1.1 & 3.1). Before every major undertaking in his career, Cyrus sacrifices to the gods and waits for favourable omens, notably before the expedition against the king of Armenia (2.4.18), and his first battle against the Assyrians (3.3.34) and his major battle against Croesus (6.4.12 ff.).

Sacrifice before an impending battle was an essential part of the preparations of an army (see Pritchett 1971, 109 ff. for a full discussion of military sacrifice). In the *Anabasis* Xenophon describes his encounter with Cyrus the Younger at a crucial moment before the battle of Cunaxa, as the army of the Persian king is advancing to engage Cyrus' forces (*An.* 1.8.15). When Xenophon asks the Persian prince if he has any commands he wishes to be conveyed to the Greeks, Cyrus simply orders him to tell everyone that the sacrificial victims and rites have been favourable. Another leader whom Xenophon admired, Agesilaus, is commended for his piety; his devout observance of religious rites is the first of his many qualities listed, in Xenophon's examination of his character in the *Agesilaus* (*Ages.* 3.2 ff.). Strict observance of religious rites was expected of the heads of the Spartan state, as Xenophon reveals in his *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia*. When a Spartan king sets out on a military campaign he first sacrifices to Zeus

the leader, Δεὸς ἀγῆτιρ, and if the sacrifice is favourable then proceeds to the borders of his land, where he sacrifices again, this time to both Zeus and Athena, only crossing the border if this sacrifice is also favourable (*Lac.* 13.2-3). The Spartan king is also expected to offer public sacrifices on behalf of the state, because of his divine descent and his role as leader in war (*Lac.* 15.2). In the *Cyropaedia* Cyrus occupies a similar role, as a prince of the Persians and descendant of Zeus through Perseus (1.2.1); his leadership in all military matters is, like the historical Spartan kings, extended to religion.

μάντεσιν: Soothsayers play a prominent role in armies in Greek literature, from Calchas in the *Iliad* to the soothsayers who accompanied Nicias on the Athenian expedition to Sicily in 415/4. Xenophon believed in the art, unlike Thucydides who criticises the Athenian general for being ‘over inclined towards divination’ (Thuc. 7.50). From his own personal experiences recounted in the *Anabasis*, he clearly did not trust some of the practitioners of the art, notably Silanus the Ambraciot, who had sacrificed for Cyrus the Younger (*An.* 1.7.18) and who later, according to Xenophon, intrigued against him over the issue of whether the Ten Thousand should found a colony on the Black Sea coast (*An.* 5.6.16 ff.). The effect of Silanus’ machinations was limited by the fact that he could not mislead Xenophon by deliberately misreporting the results of his divination because the latter ‘was not inexperienced in the art of divination, being always present at sacrifices’, “οὐκ ἄπειρον ὄντα διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ παρῆναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς” (*An.* 5.6.29). Cambyses in the is advising his son that soothsayers should play the same auxiliary role in the army, rather than be primarily responsible for divination. Cyrus only goes into the two major pitched battles of the *Cyropaedia* after he himself has conducted the sacrifices and is personally satisfied that the auspices are favourable (3.3.34 & 6.4.1). On the first occasion the soothsayers are only mentioned to corroborate his public statement of propitious auspices.

The Magi, who play a prominent part in Median and Persian history as diviners of the future in Herodotus’ work, only appear occasionally to advise and support the prince in his offerings to the gods (see Tuplin 1990, 28 on the marginalisation of the Magi in the *Cyropaedia*). Their role in the Persian court, as arbiters of what is

acceptable for sacrifice, is defined by Herodotus (Hdt. 1.107 ff. and 1.132) and is clearly important, indeed Herodotus notes that it was a Persian *nomos* that a Magian priest had to be present at a sacrifice (1.132). In the *Cyropaedia* their presence is deliberately understated by Xenophon, who keeps the focus of the narrative on Cyrus as religious head of his army and empire, who later is credited with reorganising their duties (8.3.11). They first appear in the aftermath of the first victory over the Assyrians, selecting gifts from the plunder of the enemy camp which would be appropriate for the gods (4.5.14, 4.5.51 & 4.6.11). They perform the same role after the capture of Sardis (7.3.1), and, after the fall of Babylon, Cyrus reminds them that since the city has been taken by storm, they must select sanctuaries for the gods as well as first fruits of the booty (7.5.35). When Cyrus takes possession of his new palace in Babylon he sacrifices to Hestia and to Zeus and to any other god that the magi advise (7.5.57). They also advise on his victory procession through Babylon (8.3.11) and on the sacrifices to Zeus, the Sun, the Earth and the gods of the Syrians which follow it (8.3.24).

3. Cambyses now covers the first 'lesson' he wishes to instil into his son, namely the importance of having the correct relationship with the gods. Xenophon depicts the Persian king and his son as being pious and confident of where they stand with the gods, without being arrogant or complacent. The same idea is expressed in other works by Xenophon (e.g. *Eq. Mag.* 9.9 & *Mem.* 1.4.18 - see Gera 1993, 56 f.).

Μέμνημαι ... ἀκούσας ποτέ σου: Throughout the dialogue Xenophon uses the device of father and son continually recalling former educational conversations to convey the impression that Cambyses has often been a source of conventional wisdom to his son (e.g. 1.6.5, 1.6.8 & 1.6.12) .

4. οὐπώποτ' ἀμελήσας αὐτῶν; : Cambyses' rhetorical question confirms that Cyrus has never neglected his devotion to the gods, presumably including his stay in Media, though he is never depicted in prayer or observing sacrifices. Gera cites this passage as an example of Cyrus' *quid pro quo* relationship to life and in particular to the gods and to

his friends (Gera 1993, 181 n.). This relationship is a central value of the Persian *paideia*, instilled into boys at an early age (1.2.7).

ὥς πρὸς φίλους μοι ... τοὺς θεοὺς οὕτω διάκειμαι: Cyrus is sufficiently emboldened to liken the gods to his friends (see 1.5.11 for significance of friends to Cyrus and the motif of distinguishing between friend and enemy). In Xenophon's *Symposium* (*Symp.* 3.14, 4.46-49) Hermogenes regards the gods as his friends.

5. Cambyses leads this opening lesson in morality to its conclusion with a series of analogies, the lesson being that it is important to fulfil one's own potential if one wishes to ask favours of the gods. Xenophon has already demonstrated how Cyrus throughout his childhood and youth has enthusiastically embraced the ethos of self-help and is now ready to receive the divine blessings for which he has assiduously prayed. Where Cambyses and he differ in their interpretation of this ethos is the extent of this self-help and the goals to which it should be directed.

ἐδόκει ἡμῖν: Xenophon makes Cambyses stress areas on which father and son agree. Cambyses is shown as regarding his instruction of Cyrus as being a mutually beneficial experience.

6. Cyrus is careful to agree wholeheartedly on principle with the gist of what his father has said, namely that it was necessary to use their own knowledge and skills before asking the gods for help in their endeavours. He reinforces the point with a series of analogous examples taken from crafts and professions in a manner reminiscent of Socrates in the *Memorabilia* (Gera 1993, 57). His words echo the message of his first speech to the peers (1.5.7-10), which show the folly of not reaping the fruits of one's labours in various spheres of life.

ἰππεύειν μὴ μαθόντας: Cyrus' first example is significant in the light of his own efforts to acquire equestrian skills in Media and the Persians' general lack of such skills. His

mention of horsemanship gives an indication of one of his priorities for the Persian army: to develop its own cavalry in order to become more effective in pursuit of the enemy and to be less dependent on Median cavalry forces.

... ναὺς κυβερνῶντας: The use of a naval metaphor is typical in a Socratic dialogue (e.g. *Mem.* 3. 5.5-6) but in the context of the *Cyropaedia*, where the action takes place entirely on land and the Persians are depicted as a land-based agrarian society, it is inappropriate for Xenophon to depict a Persian king and prince talking of ships and helmsmen (Tuplin 1990, 17); it reappears, however, later in the dialogue (1.6.21). The verb κυβερνᾶσθαι appears in chapter 1 in a different context (see 1.1.5).

μὴ σπεῖροντάς ... σῖτον ... : The metaphor of sowing corn is also employed by Cyrus in his first speech (1.5.10).

7. καλὸς καγαθός: See 1.3.1, the use of this term here provides further confirmation of the essentially Greek nature of the dialogue

τὰ ἐπιτήδεια: The 'necessaries of life'. Cambyses equates the aims of household *oikonomia* with those of the ruler to provide for his subjects. Xenophon clearly recognises the links between the two (1.1.1) and shows that Cambyses has made his son aware of them. Hence Plato's criticism of the work in the *Laws* is even less valid (see Appendix C). Cyrus himself promises his soldiers that they will receive the necessities of life before going on to offer them new arms (2.1.15). The difference between Cambyses and Cyrus is that the former is content for a ruler to provide the necessities for his subjects. This is a guiding principle which he and his forefathers have followed, and which has led to the Persians remaining a stable but minor power in the Near East. The latter is clearly thinking of providing something greater for the Persians, namely an empire based on the subjugation of the other peoples in the Near East, whose leaders are not worthy of ruling their subjects, as his subsequent reply shows (1.6.8). Rather than be at the mercy of Assyrians and be deemed to be an inferior power than the Medes

(1.5.2-3), Cyrus wishes to be in the position of ruler rather than be ruled. The benefits of a ruler's position compared with that of a servant are discussed in a conversation between Aristippus and Socrates in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 2.1.10 ff.). The two men discuss the attributes that determine fitness to rule, and whether it is better to be one of the rulers or rather be one of those ruled. Socrates endeavours to persuade his companion that the toils involved in being a ruler are far more preferable to being a slave or avoiding responsibility.

ἐπίστασθαι ... προστατεύειν: See Synopsis to chapter 1 and 1.1.3 on the *epistēmē* of ruling. Cambyses is clearly speaking only of ruling over other Persians, Cyrus, however, interprets his words differently, to mean ruling over other peoples, whose rulers do not deserve their positions of authority.

θαυμαστόν: For the use of θαυμαστός and θαῦμα see 1.1.1.

8. ὑπερμέγεθες ... ἔργον τὸ καλῶς ἄρχειν: Cyrus' words recall the conclusion initially reached in chapter 1 (1.1.3) that it was the easier to rule over all other creatures than to rule over men. Xenophon then revised this opinion by introducing Cyrus to his readers, and now he makes his protagonist state the problems of ruling well and implicitly introduce himself as the person who has solved such problems.

... τὸ ἄρχειν σκοπῶν λογίζωμαι: Xenophon depicts Cyrus in the same role as himself in 1.1.1 ff., as a keen thinker and observer of the mechanics of government whose horizons are not as limited as those of his father.

ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ἰδών: As his words subsequently suggest, Cyrus is thinking not just of the Assyrian king and the peoples who will be the Persians' "ἀνταγωνισταί", but of Cyaxares and the Median court, which he has personally observed.

πάνυ μοι δοκεῖ αἰσχρὸν ... ὑποπτῆξαι: The vehemence of Cyrus' contempt for his enemies

is consistent with his derogatory remarks about the Assyrians in chapter 5 (1.5.11). Cyrus might be viewed as over-confident in his attitude to the enemy, but he implies that the Persian cause will have divine approval because it is just. The use of *αἰσχροί* gives his argument a moral force, by his stating that it is morally indefensible not to challenge and attack such wicked rulers. His righteousness and self confidence are justified later in the narrative, when Xenophon reveals some of the crimes committed by the Assyrian prince through his account of the various misfortunes of Gobryas, Gadatas and Panthea.

οὐς, ἔφη, ἐγὼ αἰσθάνομαι ... ἡμετέρων φίλων: As the awkward syntax suggests, Cyrus suddenly, and in a deceptively casual manner, introduces a controversial topic of conversation (see Synopsis). The Medes are not actually named, however they are obviously the kinsmen, *φίλοι*, to whom is Cyrus is referring. His description of subjects allowing their ruler to over-indulge in food, drink and sleep, and to be distinguished from everyone else merely by the scale of the luxuries and money their ruler possesses, recalls Xenophon's description of the Median court in 1.3-1.4 and Cyrus' own childhood assessment of his grandfather's type of kingship (see 1.3.18). The good monarch should be better than his subjects in all areas as Cyrus and Cambyses recognise (1.6.22 ff.), but at this point in the conversation Cyrus is referring to the despotic kingship of Astyages who rules primarily through fear rather than approbation of his moral conduct. Astyages' son Cyaxares later admits that his position as king of Medes was based entirely on his subjects' perception of him; he was king not so much through his being more powerful than them, but through his royal family, his *genea*, being expected and being thought to be better than them,

Οὐ γάρ τοι ἐγὼ Μήδων ἦρχον διὰ τὸ κρείττων αὐτῶν πάντων εἶναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον διὰ τὸ αὐτοὺς τούτους ἀξιούν ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν πάντα βελτίονας εἶναι. *Cyr.* 5.5.34

The need for training a ruler to exercise self control with regard to food, drink and sleep is also discussed in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 2.1.1-3 - cf. *Arist. Pol.* 1312A, which accepts the historical account of Cyrus overthrowing Astyages, on how Cyrus despised Astyages for his inability to use his power and his life of self-indulgence).

ἐγὼ δὲ οἶμαι ... ἀλλὰ τῷ προνοεῖν τε καὶ φιλοπονεῖν προθυμούμενον: Xenophon reiterates again through Cyrus the virtues of self-restraint and physical toughness, attributes which characterise successful leaders in his works (see Gera 1993, 60).

9. αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα: Cambyses quickly returns the conversation to practical matters by focusing on the immediate needs of Cyrus' army, in receiving pay and therefore the means to acquire provisions.

τὰ ἐπιτήδεια: See. 1.6.7. The links between *oikonomia* and good leadership - in this instance, good generalship - are once again emphasised.

καταλελύσεται ... ἡ ἀρχή: Cf. 1.1.1 for use of καταλύειν in a similar context.

πιστεύων ἔρχη τοῖς παρὰ Κυαζάρου χρήμασιν: For the purposes of the dialogue Xenophon must demonstrate the importance of a general finding reliable source of income and food for his troops. Cyrus' apparently naive trust in Cyaxares to supply all the money he needs for his troops is exposed by his father, who goes on to advise on how to secure supplies for troops. Cyrus confirms that his men already know the terms on which they are being paid by the Median king (1.6.11). He himself has limited funding as he later tells Cyaxares (2.4.9), but he is able to use his initial dependence on the Median king to his advantage by employing it as a convenient pretext to gain approval for his plans for the campaigns of the joint forces. Cyrus recognises that Cyaxares already has considerable financial burdens and therefore proposes the expedition to Armenia (2.4.9-11), and for the same reason also proposes an offensive against the Assyrians, even though Cyaxares protests that he is not inconvenienced by supporting the Persian army (3.3.13-20). Cyrus is also seeking to assert his financial independence from the Medes as soon as possible. After he has secured funds from the Armenian king he begins to investigate the possibility of obtaining money from the Indian king as well (see 3.2.28 ff.).

ἐκὼν ψεύσεται: Cambyses is able, for the sake of the discussion, to speculate about the possibility of Cyaxares deliberately deceiving Cyrus, in order to illustrate one of the dangerous situations which his son must avoid. His willingness to entertain such an idea not only reflects unfavourably on the character of Cyaxares but is also indicative of a certain hidden level of mistrust on the part of the austere Persian towards the Medes.

10. πόρος: Cambyses advises on the 'means' by which Cyrus may get what he needs for his army. His point is that in order to have some kind of *poros* a leader must be prepared to use his military might, *dynamis*, to intimidate some of the smaller neighbouring peoples, such as the Armenians, into releasing supplies and funds. Cyrus takes great care to procure regular and abundant supplies for his men (see Gera 1993, 61 n.). Moreover, he also takes care not to use force unnecessarily against the non-combatants in hostile countries in order to encourage them to set up markets for his army (see 2.4.32 and *An.* 4.8.7-8).

πεζῆν ... δύναμιν ... οὐκ ἂν δέξαιτο: On the composition of the Persian army see Synopsis to chapter 5. Cyrus operates according to the principle 'small is beautiful' in his large-scale battles (see 1.1.4 where Xenophon notes that Cyrus started out with a small army). Against both the Assyrians and the army of Croesus he is substantially outnumbered, but through a combination of tactics, superior training and discipline and choice of weaponry his army is consistently victorious.

ἱππικὸν ... κράτιστον, τὸ Μήδων, σύμμαχον: On the status of the Medes see 1.5.2.

πειστικωτέρους ... λόγους δυνήσει: Cf. Cyrus' similar attitude before the first battle (3.3.50-55). Arguments only have real persuasive force if the speaker is reinforcing an existing situation or reaffirming values held by the audience, but above all if the speaker has the authority to enforce what he promises (as the speaker in the debate over the re-arming of the Persians recognises (2.1.13)).

11. Cyrus dutifully acknowledges the wisdom of his father's words and shows an understanding of the minds of his soldiers.

τιμὴν: One of Cyrus' priorities after reorganising his army is to organise a system of reward for battle spoils for his soldiers (2.3.2 ff.). He later tells Cyaxares that he virtually exhausted his own funds in rewarding his soldiers for their good work in training (2.4.9-10).

φίλους εὖ ποιοῦντα ... : The text is uncertain at this point (see Bizos 1971, I, 41 n.) but the theme of doing good to one's friends and harm to one's enemies is clear (see 1.4.25); it is necessary and right for the general to despise his opponents in order to fulfil his obligations towards his friends.

ἀγρούς ... ἀργοῦσαν ἀνωφέλητον: Cf. 1.5.10. Agricultural metaphors are used elsewhere in the dialogue to emphasise the principles of good generalship and, by implication, good government (see 1.6.6, 1.6.18 & 1.6.22). In the *Oeconomicus* farming is described as the mother and nurse of all other professions (*Oec.* 5.17), and, like a *geōrgos agathos*, Cyrus is later struck by the large tracts of uncultivated land in Armenia and notes that the Armenians have been forced to leave the land undeveloped because of the war with the Chaldaeans. He realises that they have been unable to exploit a potential source of great wealth, hence his scheme to enable both the Armenians and Chaldaeans to work each other's land for an agreed sum of money, each people renting out their land to the other for pasture or crop-growing according to their respective needs (3.2.2 & 3.2.18 ff. - cf. *Oec.* 4.8-10 & 20.22-23). Similarly, in his campaign against the Assyrians, he proposes to the Assyrian king that the farmers and agricultural labourers in the vicinity of Babylon should be left unmolested by both armies, and allowed to work the land rather than become involved in the war (5.4.24 ff.).

12. ἀργύριον ... τῷ φάσκοντι στρατηγεῖν με πεπαιδευκέναι: The essentially Greek nature of this situation, described by Cyrus, in which he had once approached his father for

money for a teacher of generalship, is obvious (Gera 1993, 62). Xenophon has rather clumsily dropped any attempt to maintain any Persian authenticity for this part of the dialogue in order to emphasise his message that generalship, *stratēgia*, is closely connected to *oikonomia*. The content of 1.6.12 ff. and the parallels between this part of the dialogue and passage in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 3.1.1 ff.) are fully discussed by Gera (*ibid.*, 61-64). Although there are no definite answers to the questions concerning the chronological and ideological relationship of the two works, the similarities in content of the two passages are obvious. Both point to scepticism on Xenophon's part towards teachers of military science in fourth century Greece. As someone with extensive experience of campaigning, Xenophon was well acquainted with the pressing need of ensuring that an army was well paid, fed and housed, and for a teacher of *stratēgia* to concentrate wholly on tactics and the theoretical side of warfare would have been absurd in his opinion (cf. *Oec.* 4.4 ff., 5.14 & 20.6).

ὑγείας ... ῥώμης: Xenophon signposts the aspects of generalship, health and physical strength, that will subsequently be discussed by Cambyses and Cyrus (1.6.15 ff.).

13. προθύμια ... τοῦ πείθεσθαι τὴν στρατιάν: Two further topics for discussion - inspiring an army and securing their obedience - are raised, as Cyrus remembers how his father had exposed the inadequacy of the lessons in generalship he had received.

ἀνένευον: Xenophon vividly evokes the scene recalled by Cyrus and describes how, in the face of the stern and repeated questioning by his father, the Persian prince had been reduced to a state of *aporia*. When Cyrus could no longer find words to answer in the negative to Cambyses' searching questions, he was reduced to throwing his head back in answer, as a tacit admission that he had learnt very little from his teacher. This gesture is also typically Greek and adds to the overall Greek character of the dialogue.

14. τὰ τακτικά: The subject of Cyrus' lessons is eventually revealed, only to be belittled by Cambyses as being a small part of generalship; tactics are of minor importance

compared to learning logistics to control an army in the field. According to Cambyses, tactics are seen as less effective than stratagems, μηχανήματα, for deceiving, surprising and trapping an enemy, which are conceived not according to the procedures of military theory but according to the demands of each individual situation and are based on cunning and guile. Cambyses and Cyrus discuss the efficacy of stratagems at the end of the dialogue (1.6.38 ff.), but tactics are not neglected in the subsequent narrative of the *Cyropaedia*. Cambyses himself observes that the primary purpose of the stratagems, *pleonexia*, is to attack the enemy when they are in disorder, *ataktoi* (1.6.35). Earlier in the narrative, during Xenophon's account of the border skirmish between the Medes and Assyrians, Astyages is motivated by his fear lest his son and grandson engage the Assyrians when they are *ataktōs* to send his own cavalry into battle (1.4.22). Although Xenophon does not specify in chapter 6 of Book 1 what, in his opinion, could be regarded as being *taktika* (see Anderson 1970, 94 ff. for a discussion of military tactics in Xenophon's works), once Cyrus has rearmed his troops in Media one of his first tasks is to teach them tactics (2.1.20). Cyrus is then shown using such tactics in carrying out a series of large-scale military manoeuvres in the campaign against the Assyrians (5.3.36 ff., 5.4.43 ff., 6.3.21 ff., 7.1.5 ff.).

There was clearly a strong interest in military tactics in fourth century Greece. The existence of the treatises of Aeneas Tacticus suggests that the theoretical study of warfare was well advanced when the *Cyropaedia* was conceived (see Gera 1993, 71). Xenophon's own attitude towards such studies, as far it can be gleaned from the *Cyropaedia*, would appear to be one of strong interest in tactics, qualified by a disapproval of placing too much emphasis on their worth. In large-scale battles on open ground, or in the sieges of cities, tried and tested tactics were clearly beneficial. He presents the opinions of Cambyses, a man of cautious nature, whose sole experience of warfare appears to be as an infantryman in smaller scale encounters, as the voice of an older generation which has a more sceptical view of tactics.

τοῖς στρατηγικοῖς ...ἀνδράσι: The identity of the men to whom Cyrus resorts for military instruction is no less mysterious than that of the teacher mentioned earlier by Cyrus

(1.6.12). Cambyses' refusal to act as teacher himself or answer Cyrus' questions at this point is consistent with the lack of verisimilitude displayed in this part of the dialogue. It is also comparable with Xenophon's portrayal of Socrates as sending pupils elsewhere to supposed specialists in particular areas of knowledge in order to show that the specialists do not know their subject (see Gera 1993, 64).

15. περὶ ... τροφῆς ... : Cyaxares is later mentioned as providing meat for each division of the army (2.2.2). In his pursuit of the retreating Assyrian army Cyrus realises that the Persians have set out without any provisions, and so he is forced to improvise and organises captured camp followers to provide food for his men (4.2.34 ff.). The 'pastoral duties' of the military commander towards his men are also emphasised in Xenophon's treatise on cavalry (*Eq. Mag.* 6.2).

πόλεις ... ἰατροὺς αἰροῦνται: Xenophon is referring to the practice of some Greek states, notably Athens, in maintaining doctors at the public expense. Cyrus is later described as taking extensive precautions to ensure that he and his favoured subjects receive the best possible care from a large retinue of doctors he assembles at great personal expense in his palace (8.2.24-25). In the *Memorabilia* Socrates refers to candidates for the post of public doctor, "τῆς πόλεως ἰατρικὸν ἔργον" (*Mem.* 4.2.5). In his description of the Spartan army setting off on campaign, Xenophon reveals that doctors form part of the king's retinue (*Lac.* 13.7), and in the *Anabasis* he describes the retreating Greek army being harassed by the Persian army and suffering so many casualties that eight doctors were appointed to deal with them (*An.* 3.4.30). Doctors play a significant, albeit minor, part in Cyrus' army; they are mentioned in passing as treating wounded Chaldaean prisoners as part of Cyrus' plan to show clemency to a defeated enemy (3.2.12). Similarly, when the Cadusian prince makes an unsuccessful foray into enemy territory, Cyrus shows great concern for the wounded men who return, staying at their side with the doctors (5.4.18). For the rest of the narrative Cyrus' army is kept healthy and active (cf. *Mem.* 3.12.1 ff. on the importance of Athenians maintaining their physical fitness in case they are called upon to fight for their *polis*). Even when preparing to advance

against Croesus, Cyrus orders that the army must include amongst its baggage 'those items required by sick people' (6.2.32); casualties are only mentioned as having been incurred on the enemy side after their battles (Anderson 1970, 70). Some of Cyrus' successors employed Greek physicians, such as Democedes of Croton (Hdt. 3.30 ff.) and Ctesias (*An.* 1.8.26 - Cook 1983, 141).

16. ἱματίων βαγέντων ... ἀκεσταί: See 5.1.11 for a similar clothing metaphor.

ὑγιεινοῦ ... στρατοπέδου: Cyrus is depicted later in the narrative as setting up camp in a healthy location (6.1.23-24 - cf. Thuc. 7.47 for a notable historical example of a camp being set up in an unhealthy location).

περί ... τῶν νοσηρῶν χωρίων: See Gera 1993, 65 on this passage being indicative of the interest in medicine in fourth century Greece.

μάρτυρες ... χρώματα: The Hippocratic treatise *Airs Waters Places* begins by advising the student of medicine arriving at an unfamiliar *polis* to study the location and lifestyle of its inhabitants (*Aēr.* 1 - see Gera 1993, 65 n.). Xenophon displays a similar interest in medical observation in the *Anabasis*, when he describes the physical appearance, diet and customs of the barbarous Mossynoecians (*An.* 5.4.32-34).

17. ὑπερεμπίμπλασθαι: Cyrus cannot resist reminding his father of his own virtues regarding eating and is advised to set himself up as an example of *enkrateia* for the rest of his army to follow, continence in eating habits being an essential part of the Persian *paideia* (e.g. 1.2.6 & 1.2.11). He ensures that his men do not sit down to food unless they have broken sweat through physical exercise (2.1.29). The beneficial effects of exercise and abstinence on health is a recurring theme in Xenophon's works (see Gera 1993, 65 n.), in particular *Oec.* 4.24 (see Pomeroy 1994, 253 f.). When the opportunity arises for the Persians to over-indulge in food and drink after having captured enemy booty, Cyrus calls his *taxiarchs* together and exhorts them not to fall into that trap but

to leave such luxuries to the Medes and other allies (4.2.38-41). His words highlight the utilitarian nature of the alliance between the Persians and Medes whilst Cyaxares maintains control of it - Cyrus needs Median money to pay and feed his troops and Median cavalry on the battlefield, but he will not allow any further fraternization between Mede and Persian until he gains control of the majority of the Median army. This arrangement between the two peoples is paralleled in Plato's *Republic*, when Socrates discusses how the ideal state would make an alliance with wealthy state in order to have the resources to fight an enemy, offering the wealthy partner all the resulting spoils of war (*R.* 422A ff.).

σχολή ... σωμασκεῖν: Cyrus drills his soldiers in physical exercises as soon as they receive their new weapons (2.1.20-21).

Δεῖ ... τοῖς πολεμίοις κακὰ πορσύνουσιν ἢ ἑαυτῇ ἀγαθὰ: The theme of doing evil to one's enemies and good to one's friends is again stressed (see 1.4.25).

στρατιᾶν ἀργόν: Cyrus' plan to reward men according to merit is based on avoiding the situation of the army beset with apathy which Cambyses outlines here, and which he in turn describes to the peers (2.2.23-25).

18. γεωργοῦ ἀργοῦ ... στρατηγοῦ ἀργοῦ: See 1.6.11 on farming metaphors.

μή τις θεὸς βλάβη: Cambyses remains cautious and such an aside is a neat touch of characterisation by Xenophon (cf. *Eq.* 11.13, "ἣν μή τι δαιμόνιον κωλύη").

τό ... μελετᾶσθαι ... τῶν πολεμικῶν ἔργων, ἀγῶνας ... : Cyrus plans to adopt another feature of the Persian *paideia*, contests in military skills with prizes offered as rewards, for the benefit of his troops (1.2.12 - see Gera 1993, 65 & Due 1989, 175-179). His plans to foster a competitive spirit within his army are subsequently put into practice after his arrival in Media (2.1.24). When Cyrus offers the commoners a chance to share

in the rewards gained by the army, Pheraulas goes as far as to interpret this gesture as an opportunity to engage with the peers in an *agōn*, noting that the peers are now trapped in an open contest with them, “ἐν δημοτικῇ ἀγωνίᾳ” (2.3.15). Contests also form part of Cyrus’ court life in Babylon, as a means of ensuring that his subjects strive for *aretē* and of keeping his nobles divided and competing against one another instead of him, thus avoiding concerted opposition to his rule (8.2.26 & 8.2.28 - the same principle is elucidated in Aristotle’s *Politics*, when he discusses the means by which a tyrant may preserve his power, which include keeping his subjects busy with work or warfare and causing internecine strife and rivalries amongst both his rich and poor subjects (*Pol.* 1313B)). In the *Hipparchicus* he also mentions mock battles as being part of Greek military training (*Eq. Mag.* 1.20, see also Pritchett 1979, 201).

ἄθλα ... εὖ ἀσκεῖσθαι: Cyrus has already spoken to the peers on the importance of practising in the arts of warfare as a means of securing happiness and honour, and by implication, wealth and power for the individual and his people (1.5.9-10). In the light of his words on that occasion, when he spoke of the folly of practising hard and not deriving benefit from it, his comments here are a reminder that he does not intend the Persians to return from Media without some tangible benefits from their labours.

Κάλλιστα λέγεις ... ὦ παῖ: For the first and only time in the dialogue Cambyes gives some praise and encouragement to his son. Xenophon portrays him otherwise as a stern and unyielding taskmaster for Cyrus.

ὥσπερ χοροὺς τὰς τάξεις ... : Xenophon provides another Greek element to the dialogue when Cambyes speaks of dancers (on the influence of choral dance and drama on the *Cyropaedia* see Introduction D (iv)). Dancing is also portrayed as being part of life at the Persian court, and Cyrus is involved in dances when he returns to Persia for the last time (8.7.1 - see also *An.* 6.1.10 & Cook 1983, 140 f. on the *Persikon* dance); however, the emphasis on a number of people performing with the precision of movement is particularly reminiscent of Greek dancing. After the first military encounter with the

Assyrians, Cyrus halts the advance of the Persian army and orders the peers to retreat out of range of enemy missiles. They proceed to carry out this manoeuvre before stopping in their accustomed formation with a precision and certainty of movement which Xenophon describes as being superior to that of a chorus (3.3.70). The link between the organisation of a chorus and that of an army in the field also appears in the *Oeconomicus* (*Oec.* 8.3 ff.).

19. προθυμίαν ... ἀγαθὰς ἐλπίδας ἐμποιεῖν: Cyrus is given a naive statement for Cambyses to correct using an analogy drawn from hunting. Cambyses' warnings of the dangers of inspiring men with false hopes are typical of the emphasis on prudence he maintains throughout the dialogue. Cyrus does take the opportunity to exhort and encourage his men on numerous occasions throughout the narrative (Gera 1993, 109 ff.). He does so not in defiance of his father's words (*ibid.*, 65); but he interprets his father's words to suit his own needs, by only speaking with precision on matters that he is sure of, and remaining deliberately vague on those matters of which he is not. He takes care not to promise his men any specific benefits in his addresses and exhortations, just an equal share in what may fall to the Persians should they be victorious (e.g. 2.1.15-18). He gives more concrete assurances to the captured Egyptians, by offering them lands, cities, wives and servants in return for their allegiance (7.1.43), but at this advanced stage in his career he is able to make such generous promises. The importance of inspiring *prothymia* in Cyrus' army is later highlighted by the archetypal Persian 'commoner', Pheraulas, who observes that the method of close formation fighting proposed by Cyrus will suit the ranks of ordinary soldiers because it demands more courage than skill, "προθυμίας μᾶλλον ἢ τέχνης" (2.3.11). Cyrus' avoidance of making wild promises of material benefits for his men, which he may not be able to honour, is in contrast to the behaviour of Cyrus the Younger in the *Anabasis*, who promises lavish rewards to the Greeks in his army before the battle of Cunaxa (*An.* 1.7.2-8 - see Georges 1994, 223).

ἄλλοι δ' ἐνίοτε λέγοντες: Cambyses reminds his son that one of the crucial techniques

of leadership is the delegation of any potentially awkward and unpopular tasks to others. His two most devoted followers, Chrysantas and the Mede Artabazus, prove to be willing accomplices, spreading his radical ideas by proposing them themselves, seconding any of his proposals, and carrying out errands on behalf of him (on Chrysantas see 2.2.17 ff., 4.3.15, 8.4.11; on Artabazus see 4.1.22 ff., 6.1.34 ff. - see Tatum 1989, 173 ff. On the reading of “ἐνίστε” in the text see Bizos 1971, I, 46 n.). When Cyrus eventually establishes himself in Babylon, he is determined not to be seen to be alienating the Persians who have accompanied him from the beginning. He seeks to persuade them rather than order them to comply with his wishes, lest he seem to be overtly authoritarian, “ὅπως δὲ μὴ ἐπιτάττειν αὐτοῖς δοκοῖη” (7.5.71). A similar idea is expressed in the *Hiero*, when Simonides advises the tyrant to delegate the punishment of unruly subjects to others whilst reserving to himself the right to award prizes (*Hier.* 9.3).

τοὺς μεγίστους κινδύνους ... διασφῶζειν: Xenophon creates just such a major crisis in the ranks of Cyrus’ army when it is portrayed as being alarmed at the news of the composition and vast size of Croesus’ army (6.2.12). Cyrus is called on to display faith in his own judgement and his exhortatory powers in order to restore the *prothymia* of the army by urging the officers and influential men in his army not to be afraid of the enemy.

20. τὸ ... πειθομένους παρέχεσθαι τοὺς στρατιώτας: Xenophon now approaches the heart of the *epistēmē* of ruling, by discussing what is needed to secure obedience of men, a difficult task, as he has previously observed (1.1.2). Xenophon observes in the *Hipparchicus* that once the commander has armed and trained the cavalry, he must ensure that the men are obedient, or else, all the preceding work is wasted (*Eq. Mag.* 1.7).

ἐκ παιδίου ἐπαίδευες: Cyrus gives a resumé of his education and more insight into Cambyses’ role in it. After initial instruction by his father he is entrusted to the care of teachers who also teach obedience (1.2.8), and the importance of learning to rule and

to be ruled, “ἄρχειν τε καὶ ἄρχεσθαι”, the former being unattainable without learning the latter (the same phrase occurs in Xenophon’s account of the Persian *paideia* in the *Anabasis* (*An.* 1.9.4); it expresses the general belief in the Greek political thought of the fourth century that a good citizen should know how to rule and to be ruled, exemplified in Aristotle’s definition of the good citizen in the *Politics*, “δεῖ ... τὸν πολίτην τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἐπίστασθαι καὶ δύνασθαι καὶ ἄρχεσθαι καὶ ἄρχειν” (*Pol.* 1277B)). Cyrus prudently avoids mentioning his time in Media where he was not subject to the same discipline and compulsion to obey his elders.

τὸν πειθόμενον ἐπαινεῖν τε καὶ τιμᾶν ... : One of the advantages of the Persian *paideia* is that it has instilled a love of praise which enables men to endure hardship and to obey their superiors, which makes them well suited to warfare, as Cyrus himself has told the peers (1.5.12). The next step for Cyrus is to make the rest of his army also be lovers of praise, and his proposals for rewards according to merit are devised to engender this kind of spirit throughout the ranks of the army (cf. the role of general as teacher of his men in the *Hipparchicus*; one of the tasks of Xenophon’s cavalry commander is to impress on his men through speech, “λόγῳ διδάσκειν”, the benefits of obedience and of being disciplined (*Eq. Mag.* 1.24)).

21. τὸ ἐκόντας πείθεσθαι: Cambyses comes to the crux of the matter, by pointing out that willing obedience is better than obedience through compulsion. This is a theme which is present in many of Xenophon’s works (see Gray 1989, 8); in the *Oeconomicus* Xenophon claims that the power to win willing obedience is so special that it clearly must be a gift from the gods (*Oec.* 21.11-12). The methods employed on Cyrus and the peers by their teachers during their *paideia* in order to secure their obedience may not work on the commoners, who have not undergone the same education. It is therefore important to lead not just by word but also by deed, by example as well as precept (as Sambaulas’ commoner companion does for his company of ten men 2.2.30), and in order to lead by example a ruler must be genuinely qualified to do so and cannot merely pretend to be competent.

Γνοίης ... ἐν τοῖς κάμνουσιν ... οὐδ' ἀπολείπεσθαι θέλουσιν: The idea of placing trust in those best qualified in their profession to remedy or to improve a situation is also discussed in the *Memorabilia*, with the same examples of the doctor, ship's pilot and farmer being cited (*Mem.* 3.3.9 & 3.9.11), and also in the *Hipparchicus* (*Eq. Mag.* 6.1 - see Gera 1993, 66 n.).

22. Cambyses is beginning to sketch the outline of the ideal of the omnipotent and omniscient ruler that Cyrus is to become.

φρονιμώτερον δοκεῖν εἶναι τῶν ἀρχομένων: Cf. Socrates' advice to Critobulus in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 2.6.39).

τοιαύτην δόξαν: Cyrus is referring to good reputation, εὐδοξία, which he also refers to on his deathbed (8.7.8-9) as being immortal and belonging to him by virtue of his deeds. Socrates expresses the same sentiments as Cambyses here in the *Memorabilia* when commenting that the best path to achieving *eudoxia* is to make oneself as good as one wishes to be thought (*Mem.* 1.7.1 ff.).

ἀλαζῶν φαίνοιο: Cambyses' discussion of the nature of imposture, ἀλαζονεία, corresponds closely to Socrates' discussion of the same subject in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 1.7.2-5). Cyrus later explains to his men during a *symposium* exactly what, in his opinion, an *alazōn* is (2.1.12).

23. οὔτε μαθητὰ οὔτε προορατὰ ἀνθρωπίνη προνοία, διὰ μαντικῆς: See 1.6.1. Cambyses reiterates this lesson at the conclusion of his speech (1.6.46).

24. τὸ φιλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων: Cyrus introduces one of the most important aspects of leadership. He himself is able to practise gaining the love of his soldiers before applying the same principles on a larger scale with the subjects of his empire. One of his virtues was to be able to speak by name to anyone to whom he wished to give a

command (5.6.46-51). The love of his men for him is later illustrated by their efforts to rescue him when his horse is killed during the battle with Croesus' forces (7.1.37 ff. - see Howie 1996, 209 f.).

εὖ ποιεῖν: Cyrus' extensive efforts to act as a benefactor to his people, and their effectiveness, are discussed by Xenophon once Cyrus has established his empire in Babylon (8.2.1-4 & 8.2.7-9). Agesilaus is described as considering it the duty of a king to do good for his subjects (*Ages.* 7.1-2).

25. ἐν θέρει ... τὸν ἄρχοντα δεῖ τοῦ ἡλίου πλεονεκτοῦντα: As well as being a benefactor, the general must also be a lover of hard work, *philoponia*, and show great physical endurance. Xenophon depicts himself as subscribing wholeheartedly to this principle in the *Anabasis* (see Gera 1993, 66 f.), and also in the *Memorabilia*, where Socrates' physical toughness is held as model to be followed (*Mem.* 1.2.1) and endurance of extremes of temperature is regarded as a prerequisite for those aspiring to be rulers (*Mem.* 2.1.6-7). Agesilaus is also praised as being able endure the heat of summer and cold of winter (*Ages.* 5.2-3).

Although the general or ruler must have physical strength and powers of endurance, these must be allied to intelligence and practical wisdom, *φρόνησις*, for him to be successful. During the reorganisation of Cyrus' army Cyrus flatters the commoners by observing that they are in no way physically inferior to their officers and are entitled to the same rewards as their superiors (2.1.15). Pheraulas also observes that the peers pride themselves on their powers of physical endurance developed during their *paideia*, but the commoners have been trained by a far better teacher, necessity (2.3.13). Cyrus may offer the commoners the same material rewards, and encourage the officers to eat with their men to bolster the spirit of egalitarianism he has promoted (2.2.2), but he stops short of promising them promotion, and carefully avoids any suggestion that the commoners have the same intelligence as their commanders. The implication is that the difference in mental capacity determines the difference in status within the army.

ἐπικουφίζει ... ἡ τιμὴ ... καὶ τὸ αὐτὸν εἰδέναι ὅτι οὐ λανθάνει ὅτι ἂν ποιῇ: Cambyses' assertion that the general or ruler's exalted position mitigates the burdens placed on him is not very convincing. Cyrus later confesses to his sons that the burdens of high office leave little leisure for happiness so that his younger son, Tanaoxares, should feel relieved that he has escaped the stress of kingship (8.7.11-12). The intense public scrutiny that accompanies the man of great repute is also commented on in the *Agesilaus* (*Ages.* 5.6), and once Cyrus has established himself in Babylon he deliberately withdraws himself from the attentions of the public (7.5.37 ff.). Although he says that he is prepared to give up his former leisure and time with his friends as one of the consequences of his great success, this comment is designed to provoke first Chrysantas, then Artabazus, into proposing that access to him should be controlled and that he should have his own private residence (7.5.42 ff.). In the *Memorabilia* Xenophon explores the same subject and differentiates between voluntary and involuntary suffering, observing that those who suffer for their *basilikē technē* are rewarded by the fulfilment of their ambitions for their homeland and by the praise and admiration of everyone (*Mem.* 2.1.18-20). Similarly, Simonides, in a manner befitting an encomiastic poet, tells Hiero that love of honour and praise distinguishes great men from the mass of humanity and animals, and honour and praise act as a kind of compensation for the exacting burdens of high office of which the tyrant has just complained (*Hier.* 7.3 - cf. the meeting of Glaucus and Sarpedon in the *Iliad*, where Sarpedon notes that the honours they receive at home are for their prowess on the battlefield (*Il.* 12.310 ff.)).

26. Cyrus summarises the conclusions of the discussion of generalship to find out that there is one more element of this skill to be learnt.

διαγωνίζεσθαι ... πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ὡς τάχιστα: Cyrus is given a remark which is in keeping with the youthful impetuosity he displayed during his hunting trips in Media and his first military engagement against the Assyrian hunting party. By the time he is in Assyria with the Median and Persian armies he shows great restraint when engaging the enemy for the first time (3.3.46-47).

πλεῖον ἔξειν: Cambyses begins his discussion of the methods and benefits of using *pleonexia* on the enemy with characteristic caution. In the *Hipparchicus* Xenophon counsels that the prudent leader should never take risks unless he is sure that he will have an advantage over the enemy, “Ἀλλὰ μὴν φρονίμου γε ἄρχοντος καὶ τὸ μήποτε κινδυνεύειν ἐκόντα, πλὴν ὅπου ἂν πρόδηλον ᾖ, ὅτι πλεον ἔξει τῶν πολεμίων” (*Eq. Mag.* 4.13). The improbability of Cyrus being unaware of the ideas that his father expresses to him at this point has already been mentioned (see Synopsis). Moreover, in the application of the techniques of *pleonexia* Cyrus differs in the scale and the purpose to which it can be directed. Whereas Cambyses is envisaging Cyrus using it only on the battlefield, his son intends to use it towards undermining Cyaxares’ control of the joint armies and to build up his empire (see Synopses chapter 3 & 5).

27. κρυψίνουν καὶ δολερὸν ... καὶ ἄρπαγα: Cambyses lists a whole series of normally negative and anti-social qualities which are necessary for the general to learn, whilst remaining the most just and law-abiding of men, “δικαιότατος τε καὶ νομιμώτατος ἀνὴρ”. The emphasis on cunning, trickery, thieving and robbery recalls the description of Spartan education in Xenophon’s *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia*, where similar qualities are encouraged in boys in order for them to become more resourceful and more suited to warfare (*Lac.* 2.7-9). In a similar vein, Xenophon addresses the Spartan general Cheirisophus in the *Anabasis*, on the subject of stealing an advantageous position on a mountain side for the Greek army, urging him to use the training in thieving that the Spartan *homoioi* learn to help them in their current plight (*An.* 4.6.14-15). In the *Agesilaus*, Xenophon comments that the Spartan king’s righteousness in peacetime is matched by his capacity to deceive the enemy in warfare; the Persian satrap Tissaphernes, in comparison, is a mere child in the art of deception (*Ages.* 1.17).

᾽Ω Ἡράκλεις: Cyrus’ reaction is laughter and a typically Greek oath (see Synopsis). It is the only time that Heracles is invoked in the work, and he is an appropriate mythical figure to mention in the context of the dialogue, where the emphasis on the qualities involved in enduring hard work and danger and in carrying out acts of stealth

are all attributes of the hero in the numerous myths concerning him (cf. Sophocles' *Philoctetes* for a dramatic portrayal of a young impressionable man, Neoptolemus, being shocked by the similar advice he receives from an elder, Odysseus (*Ph.* 54-120)).

28. Πῶς μὴν ... τάναντία τούτων ἐδιδάσκετε; : Cyrus feigns surprise at Cambyses' words, pointing out during his education as a boy and youth he has learnt to do the opposite and to play his full role as a member of the Persian *polis*, schooled in justice and trained to protect the realm.

Τίνος ... ἐμανθάνετε τοξεύειν; ... : Cambyses answers his son with a series of rhetorical questions, in the manner of Socrates revealing something new and yet obvious to an eager pupil.

πλέγμασι καὶ ὀρύγμῃσιν ... ποδάγραῖς καὶ ἀρπεδόναῖς: Cambyses describes the hunting of large beasts, using the appropriate terminology, referring to foot traps and cords for snaring beasts. The methods and traps employed for hunting deer and other large beasts are described in detail at the end of the *Cynegeticus* (*Cyn.* 9.1 ff.).

29. θηρίων γε· ἀνθρώπων δὲ ... : Cyrus makes the obvious point of differentiating between human beings and wild beasts in one's conduct. However, in warfare basic standards of human behaviour do not apply towards one's enemy. Cyrus himself will employ hunting techniques to flush out human prey, in this case the Armenian king, from hiding (2.4.25). Xenophon argues elsewhere that a general can learn from observing the behaviour of wild beasts in seizing prey to learn the ruthlessness and rapacity necessary in warfare (*Eq. Mag.* 4.18-20). The link between hunting of beasts and the hunting of men is a theme which occurs in Plato's *Laws* (*Lg.* 823B).

πολλὰς πληγὰς οἶδα λαμβάνων: Cyrus gives an insight into the severity of discipline in the Persian *paideia* (cf. 1.3.16).

30. διδάσκειν ἀμφοτέρω ταῦτα ἔδει ἐν ἀνθρώποις: Cyrus now invites his father to instruct him in the arts of military *pleonexia*.

31. λέγεται ... ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων: Cambyses' placing of the following tale, relating to the teacher who was too successful in teaching boys the arts of deception, in a vague and indeterminate period in the past, gives the whole tale a feel of studied unreality (cf. 1.5.8 for Cyrus' allusion to the Persian ancestors). In the *Hipparchicus* Xenophon shows that children can be good deceivers when they play 'guess the number' (disguising how many counters they have in their hands when their playmates have to guess how many they have), and therefore the general must apply the same principles to warfare, because there is nothing more profitable in war than deception, "ὄντως γὰρ οὐδὲν κερδαλεώτερον ἐν πολέμῳ ἀπάτης" (*Eq. Mag.* 5.9 ff.).

ἀνὴρ διδάσκαλος τῶν παιδῶν: The anonymous Persian teacher of justice is reminiscent of a Greek sophist, who inadvertently corrupts his young charges (see Gera 1993, 68-71 for a discussion of this passage and the concepts involved). Cambyses does not explicitly criticise the teacher or draw any conclusions about his teachings, except to note that his pupils were too young and not sufficiently schooled in justice and correct conduct towards one's friends and as a consequence used the knowledge they acquired improperly. There is a much fuller and clearer discussion of the concept of justice in warfare, including the art of deceiving enemies in a discussion between Socrates and Euthydemus in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 4.2.12 ff.), where Socrates is able to demonstrate to his young companion that there are certain circumstances where normally unacceptable behaviour is necessary and desirable, including warfare (*Mem.* 4.2.16-17). In the *Agesilaus* Xenophon notes that when war was declared between the Spartans and Persians, the ordinary code of human behaviour was reversed, and, as a consequence, deceit, ἀπάτη, was sanctioned by both divine and human law, "καὶ τὸ ἐξαπατᾶν ὁσιόν τε καὶ δίκαιον ἐξ ἐκείνου ἐγένετο" (*Ages.* 1.17).

Διώριζε ... ἐπὶ ἀγαθῶ: The distinction drawn between correct conduct towards friends

and enemies is crucial to the success of the Persian *paideia* which is based on moral certainties and the inculcation of a strict and inflexible code of values. We may compare Isocrates' maxim in his oration *To Demonicus* when he advises the young Cyprian king to consider it shameful to be outdone by his enemies in causing harm and to be surpassed by his friends in doing kindness (*Ad Dem.* 26). The teacher of the Persian boys in the *Cyropaedia* is depicted as introducing potentially dangerous 'grey areas' into the education of the boys, suggesting that all kinds of behaviour are acceptable towards friends if they are 'for a good end', without actually specifying what that good end is to be. Cambyses shows that the traditional Persian attitude is that the end justifies the means only in warfare and not in the government of the Persian people.

32. γυμνάζειν ... πρὸς ἀλλήλους: Xenophon has already mentioned the adversarial element in the Persian *paideia*, describing how the boys are taught to level criminal charges against each other for their elders to decide (1.2.6 & 1.3.16-17).

ἐν πάλῃ φασι τοὺς Ἕλληνας: See Gera 1993, 68 n. on widespread evidence for the links between physical contests and verbal contests in Greek literature. Cambyses' knowledge of Greek educational practices underlines the unhistorical nature of this scene. Direct contact between Persia and the Greeks did not occur until Cyrus destroyed the power of the Lydians, and is unlikely in the context of the *Cyropaedia*, where the insularity of the Persians is stressed. Xenophon later depicts Cyrus as having knowledge of Greek society, when he jokes about one of his officers' choice of a male companion, saying that Sambaulas has adopted the Greek fashion of enjoying the constant company of beautiful young men (2.2.28). In both instances the Greek practices are implicitly depicted in an unfavourable light, as running counter to Persian values, in the same way as Herodotus depicts Cyrus rebuking the Spartan herald for being a representative of a people who have market-places where men slander and deceive one another (*Hdt.* 1.153). When Cambyses comments that the Greeks train their boys to deceive one another, one is tempted to assume that the author is referring to the excesses of contemporary sophistic teaching, which is roundly criticised in the *Cynegeticus* (*Cyn.* 13.1 ff.).

33. ῥήτα, ἥ καὶ νῦν χρώμεθα ἐτι: Cambyses stresses the importance and irrevocability of the decision to ban educational methods which involve the deception of friends.

διδάσκειν τοὺς παῖδας ὥσπερ τοὺς οἰκέτας: Cf. Hdt. 1.136 on the simplicity of Persian education and the emphasis on telling the truth (see also Synopsis to chapter 2). Xenophon deals with the education of servants in the *Oeconomicus* (*Oec.* 12.4 ff.).

πράότεροι πολῖται: 'More law-abiding citizens'. Cambyses' use of *πράτερος* confirms the impression Xenophon gives of the Persian *paideia* (1.2.2 ff.) in which the Persians are being primarily trained to be compliant and unquestioning of the *polis* (see 1.5.8). Cyrus' stay in Media has opened his eyes to the possibility of challenging the authority of the Persian state.

34. τὴν ἡλικίαν ἦν περ σὺ νῦν ἔχεις: Cyrus is now around the age of 27 (1.5.4). He is thus on the borderline between completing his time in the class of youths, *ephēboi*, and joining the ranks of mature men, *teleioi andres* (1.2.8-9 & 1.2.12).

περὶ ἀφροδισίων οὐ διαλεγόμεθα πρὸς τοὺς ἄγαν νέους: In the light of Cyrus' flirtatious behaviour with the Median nobleman Artabazus (1.4.27 ff. - see Appendix B), Cambyses' proud claims that the Persians avoid teaching their youth about carnal matters show the contrast in attitudes between the court of Media, where Cyrus spent time as an impressionable youth, and Persia. However, Cyrus uses his handsomeness solely as a means of winning favour and inspiring loyalty and affection amongst his followers. He does not succumb to sexual temptation even when in a position to do so (cf. *Mem.* 2.1.4-6 on the importance of self-control with regard to sexual desire and *Mem.* 2.1.20 ff. on Prodicus' fable of Heracles illustrating the dangers of surrendering to vice). The contrast in attitudes towards sex between Mede and Persian is also highlighted in the debate between the hot-blooded Araspas and the calm, rational Cyrus on the nature of love (5.1.8 ff.). Cyrus even allows his closest companions in the army to tease him about his supposedly frigid nature (8.4.22-23).

35. ὥς τοῖνυν ὀψιμαθῇ ὄντα ἐμὲ: Cyrus' reply barely disguises the irony of the situation; far from being a 'late learner' he has made a virtue of learning as early as possible.

Μηχανῶ ... τεταγμένοις τοῖς σαυτοῦ ἀτάκτους λαμβάνης τοὺς πολεμίους ... : Cambyses reveals that the main element of *pleonexia* against the enemy is surprise (see Pritchett 1974, 156 ff.). Cyrus certainly does employ this element in his plan to capture the Armenian king by using a hunting trip to disguise his intentions (2.4.17 ff.), and in his surprise attack on the city of Babylon (7.5.25 ff.); in both cases the enemy is caught unprepared. In the *Hellenica* Xenophon provides a historical example of how to catch an enemy unawares, when describing how the Athenian general Conon successfully plans for two of his ships to break through the Spartan naval blockade of Mytilene (*HG* 1.6.19 ff.). Conon sends the ships out at midday when most of the enemy are asleep after breakfasting onshore (see Gray 1989, 146 ff. for examples of stratagem stories in the *Hellenica*).

36. σιτοποιεῖσθαι τε γὰρ ἀνάγκη ... : Cyrus later recognises the importance of keeping his army well fed and able to feed themselves whilst on the march, and he orders that his men should have hand-mills made for them in order for them to make their own bread from any grain they come across, “χειρομύλας χρὴ αὐτόθεν παρασκευάσασθαι αἰς σιτοποιησόμεθα” (6.2.31).

37. θαρρήσαι τι ποιήσαντες: Xenophon later provides an illustration of how to deceive an enemy into attacking precipitately when Cyrus attacks the Chaldaeans. He uses the Armenians as decoys into encouraging the Chaldaeans from their mountain-top positions, so that the latter attack the retreating Armenians only to meet the onrushing Persian infantry (3.2.8-9).

38. αὐτὸν ποιητὴν εἶναι τῶν ... μηχανημάτων: Cambyses finally acknowledges the fact that enemies have stratagems of their own and are not likely to be deceived by a well-known ruse, so that Cyrus must be a 'inventor' of his own new stratagems, “τὰ

καινὰ μηχανήματα”. Xenophon accords the general the same status as the poet and musician. The art of generalship is thus in its own way just as creative and worthy of appreciation as poetry and music.

ὥσπερ ... οἱ μουσικοί: Having already mentioned dancers in a chorus Xenophon makes further reference to the links between music and warfare. Flute players accompanied Greek soldiers into battle (e.g. *HG* 4.3.21); their precise role in Near Eastern warfare is not so clear; however, Herodotus describes the Lydian king, Alyattes, invading the territory of the Milesians to the accompaniment of pipes and harps (*Hdt.* 1.17).

39. τὰς ὄρνιθας ἐν τῷ ἰσχυροτάτῳ χειμῶνι: Xenophon provides some insight into bird catching techniques used in Greece and presumably the Near East. Cambyses returns to Cyrus’ childhood and to the fowling and hunting techniques learnt on small game, “ἐπὶ τοῖς μικροῖς θηρίοις”. Fowling was considered by the Greeks to be a lesser sport than hunting (see Plato *Lg.* 822D ff. and Anderson 1985, ix f.) and in the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon implies that this kind of hunting was considered to be safe for the young boys at the Persian court, before they move into the class of *ephēboi* and to larger prey (1.2.9-10). Cyrus is therefore overjoyed to have the opportunity to hunt larger beasts during his stay in Media. Xenophon describes hunting ostriches and bustards in the *Anabasis* as a novel experience, and little more than a sideline to hunting traditional prey (*An.* 1.5.2-3).

ὄρνιθες ἐπεπαίδευντό: Cambyses refers to decoy birds, used to attract other birds of the same species to the trap that has been set for them.

40. πρὸς ... τὸν λαγῶ: The hunting of hares forms the main part of the *Cynegeticus*. Xenophon also mentions the nocturnal habits of the hare and the need for different types of hounds to continue the pursuit of the prey in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 3.11.7 ff.). Cyrus describes his plan to catch the Armenian king using a hunting analogy (2.4.25) which recalls Cambyses description of hunting hares and Xenophon’s description of

trapping a hare with hounds and nets in the *Cynegeticus* (*Cyn.* 6.5 ff.).

41. ἐν τῷ ἰσοπέδῳ ... μάχην συνάπτειν: Cyrus' most notable and decisive military conflicts take place on the open plain, where cavalry are particularly effective, as he himself foresees in proposing that the Persians should develop their own cavalry (4.3.4 ff.). Cambyses, as the archetypal infantryman, regards fighting in the open as the least favourable option for Cyrus, presumably because of the smallness of his army and his lack of cavalry. He is prepared to concede that if the Persian troops are well trained physically, their souls are inspired, and they are well trained in the arts of war, then Cyrus will have every reason to be confident. When Cyrus' troops do fulfil these three criteria and others too, the Persian prince decides that the time is opportune to invade Assyrian territory (3.3.9).

42. ἀλλὰ τῆς ... νυκτὸς προσκόπει ... : Cambyses warns Cyrus that the duties of leadership must exercise his mind at all times, both day and night. Cyrus himself has already praised the peers for their ability to use the night as well as the day (1.5.12), and he himself is aware of the necessity of keeping his army occupied at all times and of using night as well as day. When he pursues the Assyrians at night after the first battle, his men receive divine blessing for their endeavours in the form of a heavenly light illuminating their way and enabling them to cover a greater distance than usual (4.2.15).

43. ὅπως δὲ χρὴ τάττειν ... τί ἂν ἐγὼ λέγοιμί σοι; : Cambyses concludes his advice on military matters by recounting a lengthy series of prospective military situations to be faced by Cyrus in the coming weeks and months. Xenophon avoids going into technical detail at this point as the dialogue is reaching its conclusion and returning to matters relating to the gods (see Gera 1993, 71 f.). Cambyses himself admits that the situations he briefly mentions at this point have already been discussed in Cyrus' conversations with himself and other knowledgeable people - presumably the teachers of tactics and military expertise, whom he was so ready to dismiss earlier in the dialogue (1.6.12-15). Xenophon does incorporate elements of military treatises into the *Cyropaedia*, but these

passages serve as much to illustrate Cyrus' excellence as a leader and to demonstrate the author's own knowledge of military matters, as to enlighten the audience (e.g. 8.5.2-16).

φάλλαγος: The divisions of infantry into phalanxes, their use and ideal composition, is discussed by Cyrus on the eve of the battle with Croesus (6.3.21-25), and is later referred to in a discussion of Cyrus' tactical awareness (8.5.15).

οὐδενος αὐτῶν ἡμέληκας οὐδ' ἀδαῆς γεγένησαι: Cambyses neatly sums up Cyrus' proactive role in his own education. Cyrus has sought advice from those who were best qualified to teach him and has never failed to learn something (cf. Socrates' depiction of the ideal pupil in the *Memorabilia* (*Mem.* 4.2.6-7). What Cambyses does not mention is that Cyrus has also learnt from his own experiences and knowledge of his own capabilities to derive the maximum benefit from his *paideia* (see *Mem.* 4.2.24 ff. on the importance of knowledge of oneself).

44. Μάθε δέ μου ... τὰ μέγιστα: Cambyses saves his important lesson until the end, which is actually a reiteration of his advice at the beginning of the dialogue, to be diligent in sacrificing and reading omens from the gods.

κατανοῶν ... εἰκάζοντες: The dangers of proceeding on courses of action which are decided by conjecture rather than knowledge are emphasised. The good leader must have foresight, which can only be attained with the help of the gods, through sacrifices and omens.

45. γνοίης ... τῶν γιγνομένων: See Appendix C on the importance of learning from the past.

πολλοὶ ... πόλεις ἔπεισαν: Cambyses' words will be fulfilled in the unfolding of the fate of the Assyrian king and the allies who have been persuaded to take arms against the Medes and the Persians (1.5.2), including Croesus, who later confesses his folly to Cyrus

(7.2.22 ff.). They are also a reminder of the theme introduced at the beginning of the *Cyropaedia* on the impermanence of human power. In the *Memorabilia* Socrates comments that *poleis* are destroyed when they lack knowledge of their own powers and attack stronger *poleis* with disastrous results (*Mem.* 4.2.29).

πολλοὶ δὲ πολλοὺς ἡὔξησαν ... κακὰ ἔπαθον: The theme of correct treatment for one's friends is mentioned again. Xenophon later depicts how the loyal Assyrians Gobryas and Gadatas are wronged by their king, only for them to avenge themselves on him (7.5.32). The idea of the loyal retainer who is wronged by his king and is consequently avenged appears in Herodotus' account of Cyrus' life. Harpagus' betrayal of Astyages enables Cyrus to end Median hegemony in the Near East, and the Median king in defeat suffers the ignominy of being taunted by his once loyal servant (*Hdt.* 1.129).

ἐπιθυμήσαντες ... πάντων κύριοι εἶναι: Cambyses' warnings about the dangers of being discontented with one's lot in life are repeated to Cyrus on the latter's return as a conquering hero (8.5.24) and serve as a justification of his own conservatism and of the Persian state in general.

τὸν πολύευκτον πλοῦτον ... ἀπώλοντο: Cyrus himself acknowledges the temptations of acquiring material wealth to Croesus, a king who once coveted power and money. Cyrus chooses to avoid temptation by distributing his wealth amongst his subjects (8.2.20-22).

46. ἀνθρωπίνη σοφία: Cambyses defines the limits of human wisdom. His message to Cyrus is clear but bleak, highlighting the precarious nature of mankind's, and in particular the ruler's, relationship with the gods. The gods are under no compulsion to help Cyrus and therefore cannot be blamed for any misfortune that occurs, a sentiment which seems to contradict the *do ut des* principle of Greek religion.

Θεοὶ ... ἀεὶ ὄντες πάντα ἴσασι: Cf. *Mem.* 1.1.19 & 4.3.12 ff. on the importance of

recognising the omniscience of the gods.

Appendix A

The origins of Xenophon's Cyaxares, king of the Medes

Cyaxares is one of the characters in the *Cyropaedia* for whom there is no apparent historical equivalent. Near Eastern sources and Herodotus and Ctesias all record that when Cyrus and the Persians rebelled against Astyages and overthrew him, the Median dynasty was finished forever. A fragment of the Greek lyric poet, Ibycus, does raise a very slight possibility of the existence of a Mede Cyaxares at the same time as Cyrus. Ibycus seems to have been active at the court of Polycrates of Samos in the second half of the sixth century and therefore would have been alive at the same time as Cyrus and would have been aware of the rapid growth of Persian power in the Near East. The fragment in question is preserved in the ninth century A.D. *Etymologicum Genuinum* and simply mentions that Ibycus refers to a general of the Medes called 'Cyaras', "οὐδὲ Κυάρας ὁ Μηδείων στρατηγός".¹ The writer of the *Etymologicum* speculates as to whether 'Cyaras' was actually a shortened form of 'Cyaxares' or referred to another name (Cyra?). Could Ibycus have been referring to a Mede called Cyaxares, who was serving as a general in Cyrus' army? Such a man could have been a member of the Median royal family that had been magnanimously spared by Cyrus after his conquest of Media, and been allowed to accompany Cyrus on his campaigns in the same way as Croesus was retained by Cyrus in Herodotus' work, but whose existence had been ignored or overlooked by the sources until Xenophon.

Such questions arising from the Ibycus fragment 320 amount to tantalising but improbable speculation. 'Cyaras' is more likely to refer to Ibycus' contemporary Cyrus, in view of the fact that the name corresponds closely to Near Eastern forms of 'Cyrus', which in Elamite was 'Kuraš' and in Babylonian 'Kurrašu'.² This view is endorsed by

¹ Ibyc. no. 320 in M. Davies 1991, 298.

² See Weissbach 1924, 1128 f. on Near Eastern forms of Cyrus' name.

D.L. Page in *Poetae Melici Graecae*, and by D.A. Campbell in *Greek Lyric III*.³ If Ibycus is referring to Cyrus the Great, then fragment 320 is the earliest reference to him in the corpus of extant Greek literature. The idea that Herodotus could have ignored or overlooked such an important figure as the Cyaxares hypothesized above is unlikely; his account does not explicitly state that Astyages did not have a male heir, but nowhere does he suggest that one existed. He maintains instead the silence of Near Eastern sources concerning the existence of a son of Astyages. Herodotus portrays Astyages' reaction to his visions of the future greatness of Mandane's child (Hdt. 1.107-108) - which involves degrading the status of his daughter and any child she might bear, then planning to have her son destroyed - as being motivated by the fear that his own sovereignty, rather than that of a legitimate heir, will be threatened by the existence of a grandson. The Magi who interpreted his visions also have the same concern that Astyages' kingship must be secured (Hdt. 1.120), presumably because he has not yet been able to produce a male heir, and in the short term the principle of a patrilineal line of succession for the Median kings must be maintained at all costs, even if that means the degradation of Mandane and the murder of her child.

It is safer to conclude that the existence of Cyaxares, son of Astyages, in the *Cyropaedia* is entirely the invention of Xenophon. The author has probably followed the Greek and Near Eastern practice of a son being given his grandfather's name, and used the name of the historical Cyaxares, father of Astyages, for the fictional son of Astyages. Cyrus himself names his eldest son Cambyses after his father. The historical Cyaxares is described by Herodotus as a great warrior, who consolidated the power of the Medes and finally crushed what was left of Assyrian power in the Near East (Hdt. 1.103). His namesake in the *Cyropaedia* has a completely different standing. He fulfils a convenient and important role in the narrative. Above all he acts as a contrast and foil to Cyrus and highlights the latter's ability to control people.⁴ He displays all the traits that Greeks associated with Oriental despots; he is vain, weak, cowardly, prone to lose

³ Page 1962, 161 & Campbell 1991, 277.

⁴ See Stoneman 1992, 275; Due 1989, 55-63 & Tatum 1989, 115 on Cyaxares' role in the *Cyropaedia*.

his temper and a lover of self-indulgence and luxury, who pays the price for his weaknesses when the bulk of his army switches allegiance to Cyrus following the first battle with the Assyrians (4.2.10 ff.). His presence also supports one of the central fictions of the *Cyropaedia*, namely that Cyrus' annexation of Media was entirely peaceful and had the support of the Medes themselves. It would have been highly inappropriate for Xenophon to follow previous accounts depicting Cyrus as openly rebelling against the Medes, particularly as in Xenophon's account he had benefited from Astyages' hospitality during a lengthy childhood stay at the Median court and had initially relied on the Medes to re-equip his own army. The incompetence and unsuitability of the Median king provide a convenient excuse for his subjects simply to desert him in favour of Cyrus.

Cyaxares himself is finally shown removing any questions surrounding the legitimacy of Cyrus' control over the Medes, by offering his daughter in marriage to Cyrus. What is more, the lack of male heirs attributed to the historical Astyages is transferred to his son Cyaxares, who consequently offers Cyrus all of Media as a dowry (8.5.19). A passage accepted as an interpolation later on in the narrative (8.5.28), attacks some chroniclers, “Ἐνιοὶ δὲ τῶν λογοποιῶν”, for stating that Cyrus actually married Mandane's sister when she would have been too old for such a purpose. This view is stated in Ctesias' *Persika*, reproduced in Nicolaus of Damascus (*FrGH* 90 F66). According to Ctesias, Cyrus, having conquered the Medes, married Astyages' daughter Amytis after killing her husband Spitamas (Herodotus notes that Cyrus' heir, Cambyses, was the son of Cyrus and Cassandane, daughter of Pharnaspes (Hdt. 2.1)).

Xenophon's Cyaxares may not have accomplished the great achievements of the Cyaxares of Herodotus, though he does possess a trait of the latter, a common trait of Greek portrayals of the unbalanced and irrational minds of Oriental rulers, uncontrollable anger.⁵ In the *Cyropaedia*, when Cyaxares discovers the scale of his army's desertion to Cyrus' camp, he makes no attempt to hide his anger and makes violent threats against the Cyrus and the Medes, a reaction in keeping with his character, “ἐβριμοῦτο τε τῷ Κύρῳ

⁵ See 1.4.15 on the *phthonos* of oriental despots.

καὶ τοῖς Μήδοις ... ὥσπερ λέγεται ὠμὸς εἶναι καὶ ἀγνώμων” (4.5.9). Herodotus uses this standard trait of barbarian kings to explain the origins of a war between the two predominant Near Eastern powers, Lydia and Media, in the early part of the sixth century. Herodotus’ Cyaxares is affected by the same extreme and uncontrollable anger as his fictional counterpart, when he appears in a similar hunting context to Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia*. In Herodotus’ work Cyaxares gives sanctuary to a group of Scythian nomads, and soon holds them in sufficient regard to send Median boys to them for instruction in archery and the Scythian language (Hdt. 1.73 ff.). The Scythians are allowed to go out hunting on a regular basis and always bring back game for the royal table; however, on one occasion they return empty-handed and face the fury and insults of Cyaxares, a man who readily became angry “ἦν γάρ ... ὀργὴν ἄκρος”. The Scythians take revenge by butchering one of their Median pupils, and presenting his flesh to the king as if it were game they had brought back for him to feast on. By the time Cyaxares discovers what he has eaten, the Scythians have fled to the court of Alyattes the Lydian king, causing the two kings to take up arms against each other for five years. Cyaxares’ abominable feast does result in a positive outcome; the war with the Lydians is eventually ended with a peace agreement sworn between the two warring peoples; Alyattes’ daughter marries Cyaxares’ son, Astyages, to cement the link between the Medes and the Lydians.

In the chapter 4 of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon preserves elements of Herodotus’ account of the historical Cyaxares’ dispute with the Scythians: the education of boys in martial skills, the hunting trip and the importance of bringing back game to honour the king. These elements are echoed in Cyrus’ experiences of hunting in Media, and in particular the first hunting trip he undertakes in the wild (1.4.7 ff.). Cyaxares is entrusted with the guardianship of his nephew, but is unable to prevent Cyrus risking his life in killing the deer and the boar (1.4.8). Furthermore, Cyrus’ reckless determination to kill game is motivated by his desire to show the spoils to his grandfather the Median king, whom he honours by bringing in the animal carcasses and bloodied spears to Astyages’ presence (1.4.10).

Appendix B

The paidikos logos (1.4.27-28)

Xenophon adds a postscript to Cyrus' contribution to the defeat of the Assyrians in chapter 4 of Book 1 by describing the Persian prince's encounter with a Median nobleman, Artabazus.¹ In an episode which Xenophon calls a *paidikos logos*, literally 'a story of boy-love', he reminds the reader that Cyrus has matured to be of the right age and blessed with sufficient youthful beauty and charm to be attractive to the men of Astyages' court. When Cyrus departs from Media he takes leave of his Median kinsmen by kissing them on the lips in accordance with Persian custom. The Median *kalos kagathos* Artabazus, who has secretly admired Cyrus for a long time but has not dared to openly express his affections, sees his opportunity to claim a kiss from Cyrus and presents himself to Cyrus as a kinsman when the other men have gone away. Cyrus is well aware that Artabazus is not related to him, but he chooses to indulge the Mede and kisses him. In answer to Artabazus' question he confirms that Persian men do kiss one another, if they meet after not seeing each other for some time, or if they are parting from each other. Now that Artabazus has established his bogus kinship with Cyrus he is sufficiently emboldened to ask for another kiss as a farewell gesture. Cyrus duly obliges and departs on his way, only for Artabazus to come riding back to him to claim another kiss. On this occasion he does so under the pretext that he should receive one as a greeting for someone whom Cyrus has not seen for some time. Cyrus remarks that

¹ Artabazus is clearly meant to be regarded as an older man. He is not a childhood companion like Araspas who receives a robe from Cyrus in the preceding scene (1.4.26) and is later described as a former childhood companion *hetairos*, of Cyrus (5.1.2). He is a particularly virtuous Median nobleman, "ἄνδρα δὴ τινα τῶν Μήδων μάλα καλὸν καγαθὸν ὄντα" (1.4.27), and therefore his devotion to Cyrus is not shown to be based on friendship, like Araspas, but has homoerotic overtones. Artabazus and Araspas are not named at this point in the narrative (see Commentary 1.4.26), but they later have considerable roles to play as two of Cyrus' most ardent supporters during and after his campaign against the Assyrians; cf. Due 1989, 62 ff. on the importance of these two characters in the *Cyropaedia*.

he saw Artabazus only a short space of time ago, whereupon Artabazus responds by saying that the blink of an eye seems like a long time to him, because in that moment he cannot see Cyrus. The Persian prince is both amused and moved by the Mede's love for him, but does not kiss him again, he chooses to depart with the promise that he will soon return.

The premise for the scene appears in Herodotus' description of the *nomoi* of the Persians, concerning the traditional forms of greeting for men (Hdt. 1.131 ff.). According to Herodotus, Persian custom decrees that when two men meet who are equals in social rank, they automatically exchange a kiss on the lips before greeting one another. If one of the men is regarded as slightly inferior in status, the cheek is kissed, if the difference in status is great, the inferior prostrates himself, προσκυνεῖν, before his superior (Hdt. 1.134).² Xenophon notes that the practice survives to his day (1.4.27), and he himself would have had witnessed it during his own time spent in the Near East as one of the Ten Thousand. He thus uses his own experience, and his readers' knowledge of this particular Persian custom through Herodotus, to construct a scene which combines the illustration of a Persian custom with a pederastic anecdote concerning Cyrus. His use of "λέγεται" confirms that he wishes the story to be treated as coming from a Persian source,³ but the scene is undeniably Greek in character and tone and presumably originated from Xenophon.⁴

Xenophon's own opinions on the acceptability of pederasty and his contentment in including this particular scene in the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* have been called into

² When Cyrus institutes his victory parade in Babylon he emphasises his superiority over all the other Persians who prostrate themselves before him for the first time (8.3.14).

³ See Introduction D (i) on Persian sources for the *Cyropaedia* and Xenophon's use of the term "λέγεται".

⁴ Cf. Tatum 1989, 174, "All the symptoms of the courtly art of Greek homoeroticism are in evidence". Herodotus and Ctesias do not include any episodes concerning Cyrus being courted by an older male lover in their accounts of his life.

question.⁵ Such a view is not consistent with the portrayal of pederasty and homoeroticism in the *Cyropaedia* and in Xenophon's works in general. In the Budé commentary Bizo's opinion on the *paidikos logos* is undoubtedly correct when he comments that the scene adds a touch of lightness amongst the more serious content of the overall narrative and suggests that Xenophon handles the encounter with tact and shows the good humour and kindness of Cyrus.⁶ Xenophon also alludes to pederasty in a light-hearted and uncritical manner in Book 2 of the *Cyropaedia*, when the Persian commander Smbaulas brings an ugly and hairy young male companion from the ranks of the 'commoners' to one of Cyrus' *symposia* (2.2.28-31). Smbaulas is consequently teased by the other Persian peers, including Cyrus, who jokes that he has adopted the Greek fashion, "κατὰ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν τρόπον", of taking a young boy with him everywhere he goes (2.2.28).⁷ Smbaulas' enjoyment of the company of his young companion has its limits - it is revealed that he does not kiss the boy as he would one of his relatives (2.2.31).

Smbaulas' affection for the hirsute youth, far from being presented in a negative light, is shown to be a positive influence on the latter, motivating him to be eager and obedient in the performance of his duties and to act as an example of diligence for the

⁵ Sergeant, writing on Xenophon's work in general, but with Xenophon's references to pederasty in the *Symposium* and *Lacedaemoniōn Politeia* particularly in mind, states in his *Homosexuality in Greek Myth* that "Xenophon ... plainly represents the antipederastic current in Greek thought" (Sergeant 1987, 250). Tatum 1989, 174 believes that Xenophon wants to distance himself from the *paidikos logos* of Artabazus and Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia*, and commenting on the author's attitude, he observes that "the prudishness is understandable, perhaps".

⁶ Bizo 1971, I, 30 n.

⁷ Xenophon seems to be alluding here to Herodotus' comment that the Persians learnt the custom of pederasty from the Greeks (Hdt. 1.136). How & Wells 1912, I, 116 note that the practice amongst the Persians was older but contact with Greek culture may have helped spread it and make it more acceptable to Persian society. However, such historical considerations are not relevant for Xenophon's fictionalised world of the *Cyropaedia*. He does not constantly strive for verisimilitude in the narrative, particularly when he transplants features of Greek culture on to his portrayal of Persian society (see Synopsis to chapter 6 in Commentary & 1.6.12).

rest of the men in his company (2.2.30). Such a positive and utilitarian attitude towards pederasty is consistent with the numerous and varied anecdotes and episodes relating to erotic relationships between men in Xenophon's other works. In a recent survey of these homoerotic episodes in Xenophonic literature, particularly those which relate to armies and their commanders, Clifford Hindley correctly concludes that "not only did Xenophon accept the practice of pederasty as a part of life, but ... he also recognized the potential of the feelings it aroused to prompt nobility and valour. There is, however, a converse possibility - and one which alarmed Xenophon - that erotic desire might threaten to interfere with performance of one's military and civic duty, particularly on the part of a man in authority. Against this destructive *erōs* he sets the virtue of self-control (*enkrateia*)".⁸

The *paidikos logos* of Artabazus and Cyrus, even though it is an extremely brief episode that takes place in a non-military context, also serves to illustrate Xenophon's belief in the importance of *enkrateia* in a pederastic relationship. He uses the episode to highlight the remarkable self-control of Cyrus, who has realised for a long time that Artabazus was attracted to him (1.4.27). The Persian prince maintains his sense of decorum and chastity, like a conventional *erōmenos*,⁹ by refraining from kissing Artabazus for a third time; moreover, he manages to do so without offending his Median admirer. Thus Cyrus demonstrates his ability to master his sexual urges in contrast to Artabazus, who displays a lack of *enkrateia* in his flirtatious behaviour with the young prince and in doing so unwittingly confirms the moral superiority of the Persian prince over his Median elders.¹⁰

⁸ Hindley 1994, 348. In his article he provides a valuable analysis of the passages which lead him to this conclusion, concentrating in particular on the negative example set by the Spartan commander Thibron in Xenophon's *Hellenica* (HG 4.8.17 ff.), which can be contrasted with Agesilaus' exemplary conduct in his dealings with the young Persian boy Megabates in the *Agesilaus* (Ages. 5.4 ff.).

⁹ *Erōmenos* is used here in the sense defined by Dover in his *Greek Homosexuality* (Dover 1978, 16), as the junior and passive partner in the homosexual relationship.

¹⁰ Artabazus' conduct is exactly the opposite of Socrates' attitude to sexual attraction in the *Memorabilia* (Mem. 1.3.14). Socrates advocates strict control of carnal

Cyrus' conduct towards Artabazus is also a manifestation of his *philanthrōpia* and of his efforts during his stay in Media to build up a loyal following amongst the Medes both young and old, by engendering a sense of obligation to him through conspicuous shows of favour.¹¹ Just as Cyrus' show of giving a present to Araspas foreshadows the latter's future importance to Cyrus' career (1.4.26), so Cyrus' reaction to Artabazus' advances is not a display of intimacy but rather a deliberate seeking and granting of favour in front of an audience. Gera observes that "homosexual relationships in the *Cyropaedia* are almost exclusively utilitarian: while there are joking references to sexual contact, such contact is in fact minimal and the main emphasis is on the pragmatic benefits one (or both) of the partners derives from their intimacy".¹² This observation can certainly be applied to this episode. Artabazus is conspicuously honoured in front of his fellow Medes by being temporarily elevated to the status of Cyrus' kinsman and Cyrus in turn gains another loyal and ardent supporter in the court of the Medes.

passions wherever possible and shuns the temptations of the most handsome and desirable of young men. See North 1966, 73 ff. on the theme of *sōphrōn erōs*, which figures prominently in the tragedies of Euripides and Plato's *Phaedrus*; Euripides regards the *physis* of the individual as being the determining factor in whether he or she is able to moderate her passions.

¹¹ See Synopsis to chapter 4 in Commentary.

¹² Gera 1993, 135 ff.

Appendix C

The didactic role of Cyrus in the Cyropaedia

The failure of Cyrus' sons to follow the example set by him is succinctly but clearly catalogued in chapter 8 of Book 8 of the *Cyropaedia*. Xenophon reveals that as soon as Cyrus died his sons fought against each other, the *poleis* and peoples of his empire were in revolt against Persian control, and everything took a turn for the worse "πάντα δ' ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἐτρέπετο" (8.8.2). He does not elaborate on the precise reasons for Cyrus' sons quarrelling with one another, or on the reason why they chose to disregard their father's final pleas for them to live in harmony with one another. Xenophon prefers instead to write on the decline of the Persian nation in a general manner, but in doing so he leaves unexplained certain awkward issues concerning the manner in which Cyrus hands over his empire to his sons. The rapid disintegration of all that Cyrus had painstakingly constructed raises questions in the reader's mind about his apparent inability to ensure the smooth transition of power from father to son, and about the role, or lack of it, he has played in his sons' education. The text of the *Cyropaedia* provides no immediate answers to such questions, or indeed to the more general question of why Xenophon avoids confronting them. This appendix examines Cyrus' didactic role in the *Cyropaedia* and seeks to shed light on the author's presentation of Cyrus' final speech, by comparing its content with chapter 6 of Book 1, where Cyrus is advised by his own father.

Xenophon is almost completely silent on the part Cyrus plays as an educator of his sons. The only indication that Cyrus has previously assumed paternal responsibility for his sons' education, similar to the extensive role assumed by Cambyses in his own upbringing, is a passing reference in his final speech to having instructed them to honour their elders, 'from the beginning', "ἐξ ἀρχῆς" (8.7.10). Indeed, it is only when Cyrus is on the point of death that he is actually depicted by Xenophon as a teacher of his offspring - the man who has learnt from the failings of others and educated himself

throughout his life, now, at its end, imparts some of his knowledge to them.¹ The Persian princes, Cambyses and Tanaoxares, are simply mentioned as accompanying their father from Babylon to Persia, and being present along with Cyrus' friends, and the leaders of the Persians, to hear his deathbed speech (8.7.5). This silence has led to two opposing views of how Xenophon intended the transition of power in his version of the Persian Empire, with its accompanying advice from father to son, to be understood. On the one side there is the antipathy of Plato to this aspect of the *Cyropaedia*, in a passage on the succession of Persian kings in his *Laws* (Lg. 694A-696A). On the other side, recent scholars have sought to defend Xenophon by pointing out that Plato's criticism of the work is invalid, and that Xenophon does portray Cyrus educating his sons in order to ensure that his great achievements are not undone.

The attack on the *Cyropaedia* in Plato's *Laws*, a work which is accepted to be a chronologically later work, is not explicit but nevertheless effective.² Although he does not mention his sources, Plato's version of Persian history draws partly on the Herodotean account of the careers of the Persian kings, but is mainly inspired by the *Cyropaedia*. Plato praises the rule of Cyrus and the Persian king's military abilities, but criticises the king's lack of knowledge of correct education and of *oikonomia*. He argues that Cyrus' lack of foresight in these two areas led to the two sons being left to their own devices in the royal harem, living in Median luxuriousness surrounded by women and corrupting influences. When Cyrus died the sons were obviously unable to cope with his mighty legacy, the crowning irony being that Cyrus, the man who was a father figure to the men in his army, and then to the subjects of his vast empire, was not a proper father to his own sons. Of Cyrus' successors, only Darius was a successful ruler because he did not come from a royal background, though he too fell into the same trap of pampering rather than educating his son, Xerxes, with similarly disastrous results.

¹ See *Mem.* 2.1.1 ff. on educating men to rule; see also Gera 1993, 115-131, Due 1989, 131-135 & Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1985, 459-471 for analyses of the deathbed scene and comparisons of Xenophon's account to Herodotus' and Ctesias' version of events and later Iranian literature.

² See Gera 1993, 125, & Tatum 1989, 225-234 for a thorough analysis of Plato's criticism in this passage.

At the heart of Plato's simple yet devastating critique of Cyrus and Persia, is the conviction that Xenophon has presented an ill-defined, incorrect ideal of education throughout the *Cyropaedia*, which can be refuted by simply imagining some details of Cambyses' and Tanaoxares' *paideia*.³

Plato's veiled criticism of the *Cyropaedia* has been countered by Tatum, who demonstrates that the arguments put forward in the *Laws* are disingenuous.⁴ The Athenian philosopher does not make allowance for the deliberate blurring of the historical and fictional in the narrative, nor does he acknowledge the focusing of Xenophon's work on one particular historical ruler. The career of Cyrus described by Xenophon is a conscious blend of history and fiction, but once it is over, the problems and weaknesses of the historical Persian Empire are immediately revealed without sentiment. As Tatum notes, "One writer's economy of design thereby becomes in another's view an oversight to be corrected".⁵ Xenophon does not give any details of the upbringing of Cyrus' sons, but there is nothing in the narrative to suggest that they have been neglected or improperly educated. Indeed, Cyrus' final speech is not only a valediction but also a didactic exhortation to his sons to obey his wishes and live in harmony. At the point of death Cyrus is presented as being concerned that his sons follow his wishes and learn from his example. The greater part of his speech (8.7.9-25) is devoted to instructing them, and Gera goes as far as to say, "Cyrus *did* devote time and energy to the moral instruction of his sons and consequently should not be held responsible for subsequent events".⁶

It is a measure of what Xenophon leaves unsaid at the end of the *Cyropaedia* that neither point of view can be immediately discounted. His primary intention is to prepare the readers for his brief but condemnatory analysis of the decline of Persia after Cyrus, without implicating the central character of his work as being responsible for the

³ See Tatum 1989, 227 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 229-230.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 231.

⁶ Gera 1993, 125.

ensuing chaos. The text itself makes it clear that the author has no intention of making Cyrus culpable for the failure of his successors. In the *Memorabilia* Xenophon seeks posthumously to exonerate Socrates from the charges of his accusers of corrupting youth, and comments on paternal responsibility for young men's deeds. He points out that fathers who live with their sons are not held responsible for their offspring's wrongdoing if they themselves are deemed to be prudent men, and claims that the same dictum should have been applied to Socrates (*Mem.* 1.2.27-28). This dictum could also be applied to his portrayal of Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia*. At no point in the narrative does Xenophon suggest that his hero has failed in his duty to educate his sons. It is made clear throughout the work that Cyrus leads both his soldiers and his subjects by example, inspiring them to follow the same high standards that he sets himself, and therefore one would have expected that his own career would have provided a clear lead for Cambyses and Tanaoxares to follow. Having led a blameless life, singularly favoured by the gods, as Cyrus himself recognises (8.7.6), he is not made to bear any responsibility for his sons' crimes, which are committed after his death. Cyrus dies secure in the knowledge that his own fame will live forever, and is simply grateful to the gods that both of his sons will survive him.⁷

In a work dominated throughout by the exploits and experiences of Cyrus, it is possible that the reason for the virtual anonymity of the Persian princes is simply Xenophon's desire to remain faithful to the goal of his work stated in the opening chapter (1.1.6), which is the study of Cyrus, and only Cyrus, and not of the Persian Empire and the men who ruled it after him. However, his reticence regarding Cyrus' sons is much more likely to stem from his difficulty in interpreting the historiographical versions of the succession to Cyrus' throne, which include the madness of the elder son Cambyses, the murder of his younger brother and his own premature death, a version of which is recounted in Herodotus (*Hdt.* 3.31 ff.). Gera rightly points out that Xenophon is "explaining awkward historical facts without actually referring to them in

⁷ Cf. *Hdt.* 1.30-33 for Solon's speech to Croesus on examples of men whom the Athenian sage believes to have been *eudaimōn*, notably the Athenian Tellus; see also Sage 1991, 61-79, Gera 1993, 119 n.

any actual way"; hence the gaps in the narrative which are puzzling to the modern reader, and have led to differing interpretations of the ending of the *Cyropaedia*.⁸

Xenophon also has to deal with awkward historical facts concerning the later career and death of Cyrus. Herodotus depicts this period in the Persian king's life as encompassing the transformation of Cyrus from being the wise, compassionate warrior king into the bloodthirsty despotic ruler, whose greed for more land and power ultimately leads to death and disfigurement at the hands of the Massagetae.⁹ Xenophon, as has been shown earlier, is strongly influenced by Herodotus (see Introduction D (v)) and, wherever possible, tries not to diverge openly from Herodotus' account of Cyrus' life or, if he decides to do so, he remains faithful to the spirit of the Herodotean account, rather than deliberately contradicts it. Therefore, rather than deal with a part of the Persian king's life which his audience would have known from Herodotus as being one of degeneration and cruelty, he prudently avoids it before proceeding to give his own interpretation of where and in what manner Cyrus died - a version based on his account of Socrates' death in the *Apology* and reminiscent of Cyrus' death in Ctesias' *Persika*.¹⁰ Despite his careful avoidance of the generally defamatory Greek historical tradition surrounding Cyrus' later years, Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus in chapter 7 of Book 8 fails to leave a convincing impression on the modern reader, unlike his description of his protagonist's childhood and early manhood.

In view of this deliberate reticence on the part of Xenophon, what kind of impression is one supposed to have of Cyrus as a father and educator of his sons in the *Cyropaedia*? Given the events after his death Cyrus may initially seem to compare unfavourably with his father as an educator of his sons. It could be argued, in keeping with the arguments advanced in Plato's *Laws*, that Cyrus' pleas for fraternal co-operation are presented by Xenophon as the desperate afterthoughts of the dying king, and they are bound to be ignored. Cyrus' concentration on enlarging and maintaining his absolute control of his great empire could have, until this critical

⁸ Gera 1993, 124.

⁹ See Avery 1972, 529-546.

¹⁰ Gera 1993, 116-18.

moment, blinded him to the obvious problems lurking closer to home, namely the rivalry between his two sons. Yet there is nothing in the text to support this argument or to suggest that Cyrus has overlooked the question of succession or of the education of his sons. Although he is only depicted once as teaching them, Xenophon seems to imply there that Cyrus' speech to his sons is not an unique or unprecedented occurrence but represents the culmination of his educational efforts to them in the same way as Cambyses' conversation with him reviewed the Persian king's efforts to educate his son throughout his childhood and youth.

The importance of learning from conversation and the company of wise men is highlighted in a passage in the *Memorabilia*, in which Xenophon articulates his opinions on the nature and teachability of the art of statesmanship in a far more cogent and concise manner than in the *Cyropaedia* (*Mem.* 4.2.1 ff.). Socrates seeks to provoke a young man, Euthydemus, who has amassed a large library of learned works, into engaging in conversation with him in order to demonstrate that the young man's supposed wisdom is actually based on very shaky foundations and that Euthydemus' learning masks a lack of knowledge of himself. When Socrates is asked, in earshot of Euthydemus, whether Themistocles owed his status as a leader of the *polis* to keeping the company of wise men or to his own natural abilities, "φύσει", Socrates replies that just as minor skills and crafts require good teachers so it would be wrong to assume that the greatest skill of all, statesmanship, can come to a man automatically (*Mem.* 4.2.2). Euthydemus later confesses to Socrates that he seeks to know that particular type of *aretē* which distinguishes statesmen, estate managers (*oikonomikoi*), and rulers in general from the rest of mankind (*Mem.* 4.2.11). Socrates goes on to prove to his young protégé that the path to wisdom and to the *aretē* of statesmanship cannot simply be learnt from books nor without training from others.

The close correspondence of thought and content of the *Memorabilia* and the *Cyropaedia* would seem to preclude any contradiction of the Socratic views on the teachability of statesmanship in the latter work. Following the line of argument advanced in the *Memorabilia*, it would have been ideologically unacceptable for Xenophon to allow Cyrus to leave his sons to their own educational devices. However,

there is a limit to what Cyrus can teach them. In making the case for learning statesmanship through studying and conversing with the appropriate teachers in the *Memorabilia*, Xenophon does not entirely discount the importance of the *physis* of the pupil, which must be allied to the correct *paideia* to produce the right results. If the three criteria Xenophon used for determining Cyrus' greatness, *genea*, *physis* and *paideia* (1.1.6), are applied to judging the conduct of his sons, the author never implies that their failings are due to the neglect of their *paideia*. Xenophon demonstrates throughout the work that the qualities which constitute the *epistēmē* of leadership are innate in Cyrus, and are the result not just of his *genea* or his *paideia* but also his *physis*, and therefore cannot be easily copied or taught. Even if the lineage and education of Cyrus' sons are faultless, these two elements do not provide any guarantees of innate goodness and ability to rule; such qualities, if they exist at all, can only reside within the individual *physeis* of both young men.

Both Cambyses and Cyrus in the two respective scenes, fulfil their paternal duties to their sons in the time-honoured tradition of fathers in Greek and Near Eastern wisdom literature. A key to understanding Cyrus' didactic role as represented by Xenophon in the *Cyropaedia* is to compare Cyrus' words of advice to his sons in chapter 7 of Book 8 with the dialogue between father and son in chapter 6 of Book 1, and to observe the similarities and differences in Xenophon's approach to both scenes. The similarities between the two scenes lie in the formal and overtly didactic nature of the two fathers' speeches. Just as in 1.6, the scene represented in 8.7 has been conceived primarily with the overall didactic purpose of the work in mind, and the working-out of the narrative is subordinated to the author's intention of communicating certain values and precepts to the readers. The precepts covered in this scene recall Cambyses' advice to Cyrus in 1.6: one must learn to fear and reverence the gods above all, then one's fellow men, to distinguish between friend and enemy, to value fidelity in one's subjects, and to use the past to illuminate the present.¹¹ As in 1.6 there is no sign of intimacy or affection between father and sons. Dramatically both fathers may address their advice to their

¹¹ Cf. 1.6.45 "γνοίης δ' ἂν ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν γιγνομένων" & 8.7.24 "παρὰ τῶν προγεγεννημένων μανθάνετε".

offspring but the text is addressed to a wider audience. Cyrus' maxims in 8.7 are included not so much for the benefit of his sons but as last reminders of principles embodied in the story now reaching its close.

Yet there are obvious differences between the two episodes. Cambyses and Cyrus may express the same time-honoured values but do so in differing circumstances and with different attitudes. In 1.6 Cyrus' father is not approaching the end of his life nor is he bequeathing his power to his successor. Although Cambyses is presiding over Cyrus' assumption of command of the Persian expedition to Media, he is doing so only after it has been agreed by the Persian elders (1.5.5) and not as a result of his own personal will, in the way that the dying Cyrus alone decides the succession to the Persian throne. Cambyses' dialogue with Cyrus takes place in private, with the son taking a full part in their conversation; in contrast, Cyrus' two sons are part of an audience of friends and high-ranking Persians gathered around his deathbed and are passive recipients of his instructions rather than interlocutors in a conversation with him. What is more, his speech is motivated not just by paternal duty but also by the exigencies of the situation, which requires that his will concerning the succession to the throne should be made known before he dies.

The crucial difference between Xenophon's portrayal of the two fathers in these two scenes - which dispels any unfavourable comparisons between Cyrus and his own father as teachers - is the differing levels of prescience, *προνοία*, shown by both men. *Pronoia* is one of the best attributes a king can have,¹² but Cambyses, who is shown to be wise on so many matters, shows no awareness of how spectacularly his son's career will progress once removed from the confines of Persia. In the course of fulfilling his paternal duties he sees himself as contributing to his son's *paideia*, even though Cyrus has long since attained manhood, little realising that Cyrus does not wish to fashion himself in the image of his father and forefathers and has developed into a supremely ambitious, self-reliant young man. In contrast, when Cyrus delivers his advice to his

¹² Cf. *Ages.* 8.5 - see Farber 1979, 506 f. on *pronoia* in Xenophon's works: "Xenophon takes it as a matter of course that anyone in a position of authority or ownership will need to exercise forethought for his charges".

own sons, he shows that he is aware of the impending conflict between his sons and is resigned to what will follow after his death. Although he glories in his own achievements, the tone of his speech dramatically changes when he passes to the potential for discord within his family. His two sons, who have been left in obscurity - not necessarily in the state of luxury and vice surmised by Plato - now have to assume their responsibilities and live up to the high standards that he has set. His words of wisdom are accordingly modified in comparison with those of his own father all those years before and indicate, in sharp contrast to his own father's mood in chapter 6 of Book 1, a lack of confidence in his sons. They are devoted to a large extent to the theme of sibling rivalry, and its dangers, although they are deliberately couched in general terms, in a manner reminiscent of Herodotus' accounts of monarchs who are warned in general terms by wise advisors but choose to ignore these warnings with disastrous results.¹³ Xenophon uses the occasion of Cyrus' death to give a final reminder to his audience of the principles embodied in the story reaching its close; the evil consequences that stem from his death are due to his sons ignoring his advice, thus confirming the validity of his warnings.

Cyrus is shown as not so much careless of the upbringing of his sons, as powerless to prevent the disastrous consequences of his allocation of power between them. He implicitly predicts the outcome of events after his death. His warnings of civil strife foreshadow a sequence of events which are recounted with the same air of inevitability which characterises the account of his own relentlessly successful career. Although he resorts to using the concept of the immortality of his soul, freed from the bonds of the body and even more intelligent than ever, watching over them,¹⁴ and warns his sons not to presume that his death means the end of his presence on the earth (8.7.17-20), Cyrus is aware that this counsel may not be enough at this late stage and

¹³ See Cobet 1971, 164-176 where he demonstrates that the careers of Croesus, Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius and Xerxes in Herodotus' work follow a common pattern, which includes the rejection of advice by a wise advisor.

¹⁴ Cf. Aeschylus' *Persae*, where the ghost of Darius appears in order to lament the fate of the Persian expedition of Xerxes (*Pers.* 681 ff.) and to complain that his son has not listened to his advice (782-783).

that he cannot be certain that his sons will heed his words. Even his final advice to Cambyses and Tanaoxares - to learn from the past - takes on a different meaning in the light of his own life, which has seen him strive to gain his independence from parental control from a very early age onwards, and to use history to show that the Persian ancestors had underachieved while he could offer a new way forward for the Persian people (1.5.7 ff.).¹⁵

One of the lessons Cyrus learned from the past was that some hereditary rulers, in particular Astyages and Cyaxares, did not merit their exalted positions as leaders of their people (see his criticism of the Median rulers in 1.6.8), hence his concerted efforts to show that he was worthy of his own position of power and to create an army that was organised on meritocratic principles, with men being honoured according to their skill and valour rather than their status in the Persian *polis*. These principles also inform the administration of Cyrus' empire in Book 8 (8.1.14 ff.). He remains the remote, yet omnipotent and impartial leader at the heart of the empire; relying on Persian military superiority to secure the obedience of his subjects, making those men who have power and rank in his empire keep close attendance on his court, appointing a network of satraps and officials on the basis of merit to rule over their respective subject peoples. The durability of Cyrus' administrative framework is continually stressed by Xenophon, who comments that his institutions and customs, "τὰ νόμιμα", which the Persian king enshrined in law, were preserved by successive kings up to his day (8.1.7).¹⁶ Xenophon then reverts to the cautionary, reflective mood of the beginning of the *Cyropaedia* and

¹⁵ Cf. the strikingly similar attitude of paternal resignation which appears in the preface of a Persian work of the eleventh century A.D., the *Qābūs Nāma* by Kai Kā'ūs Ibn Iskandar, an early Islamic contribution to the 'mirror for princes' genre (Tatum 1989, 7 f.). The author, the ageing head of a ruling dynasty in lands south of the Caspian Sea, passes on his advice in a work which is intended for the benefit of his son but dedicated to all those who might listen to it and profit from it,

But the fashion of the time insists that no son will take his father's advice, because there is a burning ardour in the hearts of young men which through folly persuades their intellects that their own knowledge is superior to that of their elders. (trans. by Levy 1951)

¹⁶ Cf. *Oec.* 14.6 where Ischomachus cites the *basilikoi nomoi* of Persia as providing inspiration for the rules by which he governs his own servants.

comments that the effectiveness of such institutions is, like everything else, dependent on the men who administer them: when the man in charge of these *nomima* is bad the administration of them is correspondingly worse (8.1.8).

There is, however, one area of Cyrus' jurisdiction over his empire where he cannot appoint someone purely on merit. When it comes to nominating the successor to whom he must entrust his throne, Cyrus is compelled to maintain power within his own family, the Persidae.¹⁷ His choice between his two sons is not based on merit, but on precedence of birth. Even though he is aware of the onerous responsibilities he is conferring on his elder son, Cambyses, he relies on primogeniture, rather than ability, as the method of choosing between his two sons. He justifies his decision between the two of them simply on the grounds that Cambyses has more experience and therefore is better fitted for leadership (8.7.9), while his younger brother can look forward to enjoying a life of *eudaimonia* without any of the worries of leadership (8.7.11).¹⁸ Cyrus does not give any indication of Cambyses having been chosen for his innate qualities or virtue, an omission which seems surprising when one considers Xenophon's account of the dispute between Leotychidas and Agesilaus over succession to the Heraclid throne of Sparta in the *Agesilaus* (*Ages.* 1.5 f.). Agesilaus prevailed, according to Xenophon, because the Spartan *polis* decided that he was better suited not just on the grounds of his birth but also because of his *aretē*.

Primogeniture may have been the universally recognised principle for the succession of kings; but, in his account of Xerxes' succession to the Persian throne, Herodotus observes that even if Darius had not been swayed by his son's argument, that as the first born when Darius became king he was the rightful heir, Darius' wife Atossa

¹⁷ Cf. Croesus' speech to Cyrus 7.2.24 where the former commends him for his royal lineage (see Synopsis to chapter 1). In the *Agesilaus* Xenophon praises the noble birth of the Spartan king, emphasising the fact that he and his predecessors have held unbroken power since the kingship began (*Ages.* 1.2 ff.).

¹⁸ Cf. Creon's speech in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, where Creon counters Oedipus' accusations of treachery and conspiring to take control over Thebes, by pointing out that as a member of the ruling family he enjoys many of the benefits of kingship without being troubled with the actual cares of office (*OT* 583 ff.).

would have influenced his decision in favour of Xerxes (Hdt. 7.1-3). In the opening chapters of the *Anabasis* Xenophon shows that when the principle was observed in the succession dispute between Artaxerxes and Cyrus the Younger, it had disastrous consequences. In a situation which has parallels with the end of the *Cyropaedia*, king Darius II, realising that the end of his life is at hand, summons both his sons to his side in order to confer the kingship on the elder, Artaxerxes, and giving the younger command over the western provinces of the empire. Such a decision, Xenophon proceeds to reveal, is not made on merit; Cyrus the Younger is presented as the natural choice for the kingship in view of his popularity and personal attributes (*An.* 1.9.1 ff.) and his death at Cunaxa is accordingly even more tragic and untimely.¹⁹

In not following the meritocratic principles which informed his choice of friends (see 8.4.10 ff. on Cyrus' reasons for favouring Chrysantas over Hystaspas), generals and governors, Cyrus is shown to be constrained by tradition. He bequeaths his crown to Cambyses, reminding both sons that such a decision belongs firmly to the Persian tradition of respecting elders and has the sanction of time, custom and law,

Ὡς οὖν παλαιὰ καὶ εἰθισμένα καὶ ἔννομα λέγοντος ἐμοῦ οὕτως ἀποδέχεσθε.
Cyr. 8.7.10

The difference in the aged Cyrus' attitude towards Persian customs, compared with his disparaging remarks as a young man on the Persian forefathers in his speech of 1.5.7 ff., is great but not inexplicable. Cyrus' actions on his return to Persia are those of a man who is trying to appease the Persian people and institutions which he had sought to undermine as a young man. Xenophon implies that the reason for the king's visit at such an advanced age, "μάλα ... πρεσβύτης", is that he wishes to die in his ancestral homeland, rather than in his Babylonian home, and to be buried with his ancestors; hence the reference to his long-deceased parents (8.7.1). Although Xenophon reveals that Cyrus spent seven months of the year in Babylon and divided the other five months between the Median capital city Ecbatana and also Abradatas' former palace in Susa in Elam, in order to avoid extremes of climate (8.6.22), he chooses on this occasion to remain

¹⁹ See Gera 1993, 124 f. on the historical problems surrounding Persian succession.

faithful to historical tradition by depicting Cyrus dying in Persia, to show that Cyrus is acknowledging his Persian origins and the importance of his homeland as the heart of his empire.²⁰

Cyrus is also remaining true to the spirit of the oaths his father made him swear in the presence of the leaders of the Persian *polis* (8.5.23-7), which guaranteed the privileged status of the Persian people in his empire. Under these terms he is bound to protect and to respect the *politeia* of his Persian subjects, and the Persians too have a duty to quell revolts against Cyrus and uphold his sovereignty. Having spent most of his adult life away from his homeland and ruling as a monarch for a variety of peoples, he now rediscovers his role of king of the Persians, which his father had maintained whilst living (8.5.26), and reasserts his position as protector and embodiment of the Persian values which had formed part of his *paideia*, before he left for the war against the Assyrians.

On arrival in Persia Cyrus accordingly ensures that he ingratiates himself with the Persians by diligently observing their customs. He performs sacrifices, presides over traditional choral performances,²¹ and then, in a gesture typical of Persian kings, acts as a benefactor to his people by handing out gifts (8.7.1).²² The day after the appearance of the vision, he reinforces his claims on his Persian roots, by sacrificing in high places in the customary Persian manner, to the gods, including Helios and Zeus Patrōios

²⁰ See Cook 1983, 33 for literary and historical evidence of Cyrus' use of the palaces at Babylon and Ecbatana. According to Herodotus Cyrus' son Cambyses believed that he was fated to die in his capital city, Median Ecbatana, not his eventual resting place Syrian Ecbatana (Hdt. 3.63). A striking modern example of ruler paying homage to Cyrus' greatness and using his tomb as a symbol of former glories happened in 1971 when the former Shah of Iran commemorated the founding of the Achaemenid dynasty at Pasargadae (see quote at the beginning of the Introduction).

²¹ Cf. *Ages.* 2.17 where Xenophon describes Agesilaus leading a major expedition against the Argives, then returning home in time to celebrate the festival of Hyacinthus and to take the place assigned to him by the leader of the chorus in the singing of the paean to the god (see Introduction D (iv)).

²² See 8.5.21 on the practice of Persian kings giving gifts to all the Persians whenever they are in Persia; see also Synopsis to chapter 4 on Cyrus' *philanthrōpia*.

(8.7.3). When Cyrus had left Persia for the second time for his momentous campaign of conquest, he sacrificed to ancestral gods, including Zeus Patrōios (1.6.1), primarily in order to maintain divine favour for a very important and dangerous expedition, but also to give a public demonstration of his links with his family and homeland before he leaves in order to reaffirm his commitment to them. On that occasion the Persian prince's ambitions lay far beyond the limits of his *patris* though he had to be seen to be pious and to appease the will of his father and the Persian *polis* before being able to enjoy the freedom of command of his army abroad. Xenophon now shows how Cyrus' career has come full circle since that second departure. On his final return to Persia Cyrus sacrifices to the ancestral gods, this time with different motives. He wishes to secure his reputation amongst his own people before he dies; and in addition he wants to make a public plea for harmony between his two sons who had accompanied him back to Persia (8.7.5). His prayer to the gods while sacrificing acknowledges their support of him throughout his life, particularly in sending omens and signs to instruct him to take the right course of action. He now has one final request to make of them,

Αἰτοῦμαι δ' ὑμᾶς δοῦναι καὶ νῦν παισὶ μὲν καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ φίλοις καὶ πατρίδι
εὐδαιμονίαν, ἐμοὶ δὲ οἷόν περ αἰῶνα δεδώκατε, τοιαύτην καὶ τελευτὴν δοῦναι.

Cyr. 8.7.3

And now I ask you also to grant good fortune to my children and to my wife, friends and homeland, and as for myself, to grant me a death worthy of the life you have given me.

The dying king is aware that only the final part of his prayer will be granted. His father had reminded him just before they parted at the Median border several years ago that the gods were not obliged to advise everyone and were under no compulsion to care for everyone (1.6.46). Cyrus knows that he has received divine favour throughout his life and will continue to do so to the end, and he certainly does have the calm, serene death for which he had prayed. Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus' actions and final words also convey the sense of fatalism on the part of his protagonist about the succession to the Persian throne. Cyrus is shown to be aware of his own inability to exert any posthumous influence on his sons, but he must disguise this sense of impotence in the

presence of those around his deathbed.²³

If there are any insights to be gained from Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus in chapter 7 of Book 8, they serve to confirm the observations of his own father Cambyses in chapter 6 of Book 1 on the omnipotence of the gods and mankind's comparative insignificance. Cyrus is accordingly presented as being unable to influence events after his death, particularly if his sons do not receive the divine guidance he enjoyed. One further insight to be gleaned from this passage is that Cyrus' conduct in appointing his successor, and in making provision for the future, exposes the weakness of hereditary monarchy, particularly when such a great individual as Cyrus attempts to transfer an empire which is the embodiment of his own virtues and values to an heir who does not share these qualities. The Persian *paideia* outlined in chapter 2 of Book 1 is adapted to the needs of a small monarchic *polis*, which resists change and opportunities to expand its power and influence, and cannot cope with the demands of educating future rulers of a vast empire. Cyrus himself recognises this problem in his dialogue with his father (see 1.6.8), although the latter chooses not to address his son's loaded question, remarking that sometimes it is not particular individuals but circumstances which must be overcome (see 1.6.9). At the end of his life, Cyrus, bound by his covenant with the Persian people to uphold their primacy and their laws, is unable to overcome the circumstances which dictate that his elder son Cambyses will succeed to his throne regardless of merit.²⁴ The ending of the *Cyropaedia* can be regarded as endorsing the argument subsequently advanced in Plato's *Laws* that wealth and physical attributes are not criteria for bestowing office on a man unless he has virtue, allied to self-control; above all, he must have the support of the gods.²⁵

²³ Cf. Herodotus' account of the downfall of Croesus where the Lydian king's misfortunes teach him about the inevitability of fate (Hdt. 1.91).

²⁴ Cf. Aristotle's views on the downfall of monarchies. He observes that kingship is more often destroyed from within and that the downfall of hereditary kingship is often brought about by those inheriting power losing the respect of their subjects (*Pol.* 1312B-1313A).

²⁵ Cf. *Oec.* 21.11-12, where Ischomachus stresses the importance of the natural leader receiving divine support.

Appendix D

From Machiavelli to Court Masque: The 'Nachleben' of the Cyropaedia

The figure of Cyrus the great king, as portrayed by Xenophon in the *Cyropaedia*, was sustained in Hellenistic and Roman times,¹ and was given a further lease of life in the Renaissance. Tatum begins *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction* with an entertaining and informative chapter entitled, "The Classic as a Footnote", which traces the influence of the *Cyropaedia* in later antiquity and in the literature of the Renaissance and the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.² Tatum's approach highlights the extent to which the work was read, discussed, admired and used by writers of mirrors for princes and political philosophers of the Renaissance, before being "abandoned to the novelists and poets".³ He discerns a pattern in the treatment of the *Cyropaedia* in Hellenistic and Roman times, and also in the Renaissance and subsequent centuries, consisting of the gradual diminution of the work's status, as both readers and authors no longer sought from it personal moral instruction, or education on how to gain and increase political power, but concentrated on the romantic elements in the work. Tatum dates the modern decline of the *Cyropaedia* to the seventeenth century and the publication of Mlle. de Scudéry's romantic novel *Artamène ou le Grand Cyrus*.⁴ This work provided the inspiration for a romanticised view of the *Cyropaedia* in the Restoration drama *Cyrus*

¹ Karl Münscher's *Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Literatur* provides a valuable survey of later Greek and Roman authors' interest in the works of Xenophon, including the *Cyropaedia*. Elizabeth Rawson in *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought* comments on the interest in Spartan ideals in Rome, noting that, "It would be a mistake to try to isolate too precisely the various streams of influence that went to make up Roman laconism. Xenophon had a great vogue in the second century B.C., and from its later years Stoicism gained ground in the governing class" (Rawson 1969, 100).

² Tatum 1989, 3-35.

³ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 22 ff.

the Great: or, the Tragedy of Love which has hitherto escaped the attention of classical scholars working on the *Cyropaedia* (see below). However, the origins of the romanticisation of the work can be traced back even earlier to the sixteenth century, and they stem not just from a shift in readers' preferences but from the ambiguity which was central to Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus.⁵

On one level Cyrus is the ideal ruler who is used to articulate the beliefs of Xenophon and to serve as an example to his subjects and mankind. As such, he is a somewhat cold and characterless figure, who proceeds methodically and scrupulously to create a just empire with himself at its centre.⁶ On the other level, Cyrus is a ruthless, calculating figure, who uses his exalted position and his reputation as a paragon of virtue and good leadership to manipulate and control those around him, both friends and enemies. Both interpretations of Xenophon's Cyrus are present in two sixteenth century works of Western Europe, one work being distinguished by its obscurity the other by its notoriety - the anonymous Elizabethan play *The Wars of Cyrus* (which is not mentioned in Tatum's survey of Renaissance literature) and Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince*. The former shows how the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* can be transformed into a basic melodrama which marginalises the role of Cyrus into that of a worthy, soldier-king who is almost incidental to the main plot of the play. The latter shows how the insights into leadership provided by Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus can be applied to a treatise that is designed for the political climate of early sixteenth century Italy, but is also a timeless exposition of the mechanics of acquiring and maintaining power.

Although *The Wars of Cyrus* was published in 1594, it was performed at a much earlier date, probably in 1576 or 1577.⁷ The play was written for child actors, namely

⁵ See Introduction A for a discussion of Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus.

⁶ Such a view is illustrated by Cicero's oft-quoted judgement on the *Cyropaedia* in one of his *Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem*, "Cyrus ille a Xenophonte non ad historiae fidem scriptus sed ad effigiem iusti imperii, cuius summa gravitas ab illo philosopho cum singulari comitate coniungitur" (*Q.Fr.* 1.1.8).

⁷ On the dating and general discussion of *The Wars of Cyrus* I am indebted to James Paul Brawner's *The Wars of Cyrus: an Early Classical Narrative of the Child Actors* which was published in 1942 and contains a critical edition of the text,

the Children of the Chapel Royal of Windsor, who performed regularly at the court of Elizabeth I. The author may have been Richard Farrant, a musician and dramatist who between 1576 and 1580 was employed as Master of the Chapel, and, in common with other dramatists of this period, used classical sources for his plays. There is no evidence to confirm that *The Wars of Cyrus* was actually performed before the Queen, but the play remains noteworthy as one of the earliest plays performed at the original Blackfriars theatre in London, the first private theatre of the Elizabethan age. It is also important as the only surviving example of classical narrative dramas performed by child actors at Court. Although the play may never have had a royal audience, its content would have been pleasing entertainment for a monarch, with its portrayal of Cyrus as the embodiment of regal virtue and dignity, who is above the intrigues and jealousies of both his enemies and supporters.

In the prologue the author claims Xenophon as the source for a play which concentrates on the figure of Panthea, not Cyrus,

That Zenophon, from whence we borrow, [writ],
Being both a souldier and philosopher,
Warrants what we record of Panthea.⁸

The play is loosely based around the narrative of Books 4-7 of the *Cyropaedia*, and the author appears to have used the translation by William Barker (or Bercker), who published a complete translation of the *Cyropaedia* in 1567, as well as relying on a Latin translation or a Latin/Greek edition.⁹ However, he embellishes and considerably alters the narrative of Xenophon by introducing a number of characters and sub-plots and motifs which belong more to the realms of sixteenth century drama than the *Cyropaedia*. The convoluted drama unfolds against the backdrop of Cyrus' war against the evil Assyrian king Antiochus, culminating with Cyrus' victory over him in battle. The main plot concerns the story of Panthea, Araspas and Abradatas and proceeds along the same

introduction and notes.

⁸ *The Wars of Cyrus* Prol., 8-10.

⁹ Brawner 1942, 20 ff.

lines as that of the *Cyropaedia*. There is also a related sub-plot involving Gobryas, his daughter Alexandra and her page Libanio and an Assyrian nobleman Dinon, as well as the story of Ctesiphon, the Assyrian sent to Cyrus' camp to assassinate the Persian king. The author borrows and adapts from the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* and other classical literature to produce a tragedy of incident, not of character, which to modern eyes has little artistic merit.

The lack of character development in *The Wars of Cyrus* is to some extent due to the limitations of the author and to the author's acknowledgement of the limitations of child actors when writing the parts.¹⁰ This weakness in characterisation is particularly apparent in the figure of Cyrus, who makes a limited contribution to the play as an impartial instrument of justice who is there to facilitate the plans of the other characters. However, the colourless nature of Cyrus' character is also determined by one of the author's primary concerns, namely that his work should have a strong ethical content. This concern is obvious in a play which presents a triumph of virtue over vice in its depiction of the success of Cyrus and of the fortunate resolution of the story concerning Gobryas and his daughter Alexandra. Moreover, the narrative also reflects the author's dual purpose of entertaining his audience whilst simultaneously educating and edifying the children performing it.¹¹ The entirely virtuous character of Cyrus is accordingly well placed to deliver the moral and philosophical ideas which balance the melodramatic elements of the narrative with the didactic.

In this respect the Cyrus of *The Wars of Cyrus* represents the idealised interpretation of Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia* (see above), and in the conversation in Act 2 between the two Persian noblemen, Histaspis and Chrisantas (Hystaspas and Chrysantas of the *Cyropaedia*), both men describe the virtues of Cyrus in terms reminiscent of Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus' ideal physical and mental qualities,

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 44 f. Brawner notes that the play does not have a "rawness, an element of violence and abandon", which characterises plays such as Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*; in contrast "Cyrus is subdued and restrained. One can hardly conceive of children playing *Tamburlaine* adequately".

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 41 f.

Hist. Chrisantas, when I looke into the life,
 The maner, deeds, and qualities of minde,
 The grauenesse, power and imperiall parts
 Wherewith yong Cyrus is so full adorne,
 My thoughts foresee that he is ordained of God
 To enlarge the limits of the Persian raigne.
Chr. Histaspis, rare it is to see those yeeres
 So furnished with such rare experience
 As is not common in the grayest haire.
 Besides, his bodie hath of these rare gifts,
 Vsed to labour, hunger, thirst and colde,
 Giues true foretokens that the prince will proue
 A famous warriour and a conquerour.
Hist. And of sundry vertues that abounds,
 Dayly increasing in [his] princely breast,
 Religion to the gods exceeds them all.¹²

The Wars of Cyrus also includes a number of gnomic passages throughout the narrative, the most notable being the discussion between Cyrus and Araspas on the powers of love and the will in Act 1 Scene 3. This scene is directly influenced by Xenophon's depiction of the debate between the same two characters in the *Cyropaedia* (5.1.8-17). The author of the play thus assimilated the ethical and gnomic aspect of the *Cyropaedia* to produce "a purely narrative tragedy - a series of inherently interesting stories in dramatic form, with proper ethical comment and implication".¹³ By the time *The Wars of Cyrus* appeared in print in 1594 the practice of using child actors in court plays had declined, and with it the need to adhere strictly to a simple didactic narrative which tended to stifle character development. Subsequent plays influenced by classical literature, which were acted by adults in private theatres, do not exhibit the same concern for probity as the classical narrative drama written for child actors. They also have more fully developed characters and bring to the fore the romantic, melodramatic elements introduced in the earlier plays such as *The Wars of Cyrus*. This process of romanticisation of classical literature spread from drama into novels such as Mlle. de Scudéry's *Artamène*. The effects of this process can be seen in another play, based on de Scudéry's work and published just over a hundred years after *The Wars of Cyrus*: John Banks' *Cyrus the*

¹² *The Wars of Cyrus* Act 2 Scene 3, 482-497.

¹³ Brawner 1942, 45. See Introduction D (iii) for a discussion of the influence of ethical and gnomic works on the *Cyropaedia*.

Great: or, the Tragedy of Love published in 1696.

John Banks is an obscure figure in Restoration drama, who wrote a number of plays on historical themes with limited success. The *Dictionary of National Biography* records that the actors for his production of *Cyrus the Great* initially refused to perform the play on account of its insipidness; but once it was performed it met with some success. Apart from the influence of de Scudéry, it is difficult to ascertain whether Banks had read any classical sources on Cyrus for the play.¹⁴ He would have been able to read the works of Xenophon and Herodotus in translation and *Cyrus the Great* certainly contains elements which bear close relation to the narrative of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, and of Herodotus' work, as well as echoes of the drama of Shakespeare and Marlowe. The play also resembles *The Wars of Cyrus* in its concentration on the story of Panthea and Abradatas, and in its coverage of the same events which are loosely based on Books 4-7 of the *Cyropaedia*. However, the figure of Cyrus has been transformed from colourless paragon of virtue in *The Wars of Cyrus*, to a fierce warrior king in the mould of Tamburlaine, who is intensely ambitious and all-conquering on the battlefield, but prone to anger and hasty decisions. Above all, he is shown to be vulnerable to the power of love, when he suffers the fate of Araspas in the *Cyropaedia*: he himself becomes infatuated with Panthea and then loses all his confidence and judgement. Banks' Cyrus, like Xenophon's Araspas, later redeems himself by demonstrating that he has mastered the hold that love once had on his emotions, and he ends the play as the triumphant conqueror of Babylon.

Around the central conflict of the war between Cyrus and Balthazar the Assyrian king, Banks constructs an elaborate series of episodes based on the destructive passions engendered by love. He includes a scene taken directly from Herodotus (Hdt. 1.86 ff.), in which Cyrus spares the captured Croesus from death on the funeral pyre. Queen Thomyris, who, as queen of the Massagetae, has a prominent role in Herodotus' account of Cyrus' life (Hdt. 1.205 ff.), appears as a Scythian warrior-queen who is the mother

¹⁴ Brawner mentions Banks' *Cyrus the Great* as being influenced by de Scudéry's work (Brawner 1942, 126), and notes that its opening scene resembles that of *The Wars of Cyrus*.

of Panthea. Xenophon's story of Panthea and Abradatas is embroidered to include Cyrus' love for the captive Panthea, which leads him to banish temporarily his friend Hystaspes, who has also fallen in love with her. Panthea and Abradatas in *Cyrus the Great* are lovers who have been unable to complete their nuptials as a result of Abradatas' being summoned to fight for Croesus. Abradatas remains an enemy of Cyrus throughout the play, even when Cyrus is shamed into returning Panthea to him, and meets his death fighting valiantly against the Persians. The plot is further complicated by the introduction of the character of Croesus' daughter, Lausaria, who is in love with Cyrus and is driven mad by his inability to return her affections. Lausaria commits suicide, although her ghost later appears to guide Cyrus through the battlefield to where Panthea grieves over the dismembered corpse of Abradatas, before plunging a dagger into her breast.¹⁵ The ghost then saves Cyrus from death at the hands of Thomyris who wishes to avenge the deaths of her son and Panthea.

Banks' play does show great fidelity to the *Cyropaedia* in his references to Persian "homotyms" (Xenophon's Persian *homotimoi*), in Hystaspes' description in Act 5 of Abradatas' armour and the Susan king's final parting from Panthea,¹⁶ and especially in his initial characterisation of Cyaxares, the Median king, as being embittered and envious because Cyrus has usurped his role as commander in the war against the Assyrians. Cyaxares appears in the opening scene of the play on the corpse-strewn battlefield which is the result of Cyrus' defeat of Croesus. He curses the ambition and success of his nephew and also accuses his friend Artabazus (presumably taken from Xenophon's Median nobleman Artabazus) for his role in allowing Cyrus to take command of the army of the Persians and Medes,¹⁷

¹⁵ Cf. *Cyr.* 7.3.8 ff. in which Xenophon describes how Panthea tries to reassemble the corpse of her husband. See Introduction D (iv) for a discussion of this scene.

¹⁶ Cf. Xenophon's depiction of the scene (*Cyr.* 6.4.2 ff.) which is discussed in the Introduction D (ii).

¹⁷ Cf. Artabazus' major role in encouraging the Medes to follow Cyrus in Xenophon's work *Cyr.* 4.1.22 ff. (see Synopsis to chapter 4).

Cyax. Ah! *Artabasus*, wert thou not to blame;
To counsel me to give the Reins to *Cyrus*,
Pleas'd me with Hopes, and fed my longing Ears
With cunning Tales of this ambitious boy.¹⁸

Cyaxares, however, is warned against pursuing revenge against his nephew by the phantom of a dead soldier, who has been conjured up by four witches in a scene reminiscent of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. His anger with his nephew is not assuaged by Cyrus' gift to him of Panthea, whom he refuses to accept, and he tells Cyrus' envoy Hystaspes that he will visit the Persian king to express his discontent,

Cyaxares comes to meet him straight,
With Courage as awful as *Astyages*,
When *Cyrus*, but a prattling Boy, admir'd him,
Look'd from the Ground, ador'd his Majesty,
And fear'd him like a God.¹⁹

He is quickly reconciled with Cyrus in Act 2, in a scene loosely based on the meeting of the two men in Book 5 of the *Cyropaedia* (5.5.1 ff.), and names Cyrus as his son and heir (as Xenophon's Cyaxares does in the *Cyropaedia*). He remains a staunch supporter of his nephew and later dies defending Cyrus' camp from Abradatas' attack.

The elaborate and contrived plot of *Cyrus the Great* demonstrates the extent to which the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* and the notion of Cyrus the ideal king, as initially interpreted by the author of *The Wars of Cyrus*, could be transformed into a highly romanticised dramatisation of Xenophon's work. Apart from demonstrating the tragic consequences of the protagonists' passions, the play has little didactic or ethical content and is designed simply for the entertainment of its audience. It shows no insight into the other side of Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus, as a cunning manipulator of men, or of the value of the *Cyropaedia* as an examination on how to gain power and rule over mankind. The play represents the extent of the decline in status of the *Cyropaedia* from

¹⁸ *Cyrus the Great* Act 1 (the text of the 1696 edition has no line numbering).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Act 1. Cyaxares' words recall the behaviour of the young Cyrus in chapter 4 of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia*, when the boy is unable to be as open and affectionate in his grandfather's presence as he was when he first arrived in Media.

a work of political philosophy into a source for erotic fiction and drama. It is therefore necessary to return to the sixteenth century and the works of Niccolò Machiavelli, in order to demonstrate that at least one great thinker of the Renaissance was aware of the other side to Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus.

Machiavelli's importance lies in the fact that his political works, in contrast to those of his contemporaries, continue to be read, studied and discussed around the world. *The Prince*, in particular, has remained at the forefront of scholarly attention from its posthumous publication in 1532, and subsequent placing on the Index by the Roman Catholic Church, down to the present day. This contrast in fortunes is due mainly to the radical nature of Machiavelli's work and its superiority over that of other writers of advice to princes. His clever use of examples, both Classical and contemporary, to illustrate his arguments distinguishes him from the other contemporary writers in the same field. Machiavelli in his political works dares to draw different conclusions from those of his predecessors and contemporaries; conclusions which were not subservient to the morality of the time but based on its realities. In *The Prince*, the *Cyropaedia* is the only Classical work explicitly mentioned and recommended by Machiavelli, who confirms Cicero's assertion of the influence of Xenophon's work on the career of the Roman hero Scipio Africanus,²⁰

E qualunque legge la vita di Ciro scritta da Senofonte, riconosce dipoi nella vita di Scipione quanto quella imitazione gli fu di gloria, e quanto nella castità, affabilità, umanità, liberalità, Scipione si conformassi con quelle cose che di Ciro da Senofonte sono sute scritte. *The Prince* c. 14

And anyone who reads the life of Cyrus written by Xenophon will realize how important in the life of Scipio that imitation was for his glory and how much, in purity, goodness and humanity, and generosity, Scipio conformed to those characteristics of Cyrus that Xenophon had written about.²¹

The influence of Aristotle's *Politics* and Isocrates' Cyprian orations on *The*

²⁰ Cicero mentions Scipio Africanus' admiration for the *Cyropaedia* in one of his *Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem* (an earlier part of which is quoted in note 6). Tatum 1989, 5 notes that Machiavelli cites Xenophon more often than Plato in his works.

²¹ The translations of *The Prince* are taken from the 1987 reprint of the translation of *The Prince* by P. Bondanella and M. Musa in the *World's Classics* series by Oxford University Press.

Prince cannot be discounted, and Machiavelli also had the works of his predecessors in this literary genre to draw on. However, the influences of these Greek authors on *The Prince* are small compared with that of the *Cyropaedia*. Tatum believes that “anyone who knows the *Cyropaedia* will be astonished to see how thoroughly Machiavelli has mastered Xenophon’s text and expressed much of its essence in far briefer scope, with so much else besides”.²² Machiavelli’s knowledge of the work is not so much astonishing as impressive. By concentrating on *The Prince*, which, like the *Cyropaedia*, deals with the art of monarchy, and by examining the areas in which Machiavelli expresses ideas that are closely related to those of the *Cyropaedia*, we can gauge the extent to which the Florentine scholar has grasped the non-idealised view of Xenophon’s Cyrus as the arch-manipulator of men and applied it to the political situation of early sixteenth century Italy.

It is tempting to draw parallels between the situation and motivation of the two authors in writing their respective works. Machiavelli begins *The Prince* with a dedicatory preface to one person, Lorenzo de’ Medici, offering the work as a gift to the ruler of Florence. He has two personal motives in writing this treatise: his wish that Lorenzo will be sufficiently gratified by the gift to end his political exile, to which he refers at the end of the preface; and his patriotic hope that the Medici would seize the opportunity to rid the Italian peninsula of occupying foreign armies, which is expressed in the concluding chapter to the work. Xenophon’s personal motivation for writing the *Cyropaedia* is not so clear (see Introduction A). It is possible that the work was composed at some point during Xenophon’s exile from his native *polis* of Athens;²³ and

²² Tatum 1989, 8; he does not specify here any particular work of Machiavelli’s and is presumably referring to all of his works. Rawson 1969, 139 ff. observes that, apart from the obvious influence of Latin literature on Machiavelli’s work, the model of Sparta figures prominently in his *Discorsi*.

²³ The actual date of the banishment of Xenophon from Athens because of his support for the Spartans - which is referred to by Diogenes Laertius (D. L. 2.51) - is unclear. Anderson 1974, 149 expresses the common view that Xenophon became an exile shortly after his departure to fight for Cyrus the Younger. However, Pomeroy 1994, 4 adopts the more recent view that the decree banishing Xenophon was not promulgated until 394 or 393 B.C., after he fought on the Spartan side at the battle of

it could, as a candid exposition of his own political belief in strong leadership by a single ruler, have served as a defence of his *Lakōnismos*, pro-Spartan conduct, to the Athenians.²⁴ Machiavelli writes in his preface to *The Prince* that he is offering to pass on in his work all that has taken him many years and many hardships to understand and appreciate, "tutto quello in che io in tanti anni e con tanti mia disagi e pericoli ho conosciuto e inteso". His words are reminiscent of Xenophon's introduction to the *Cyropaedia* when he observes that the work is the result of his own political meditations and opinions (1.1.1 & 1.1.6). Furthermore, when Machiavelli states in the preface that in order to make his work attractive and different, he is not relying on rhetorical and ornate language but on the variety and seriousness of his subject matter, he echoes Xenophon's approach to writing the *Cyropaedia* and his other works in simple, lucid prose.²⁵

The emulation of Xenophon's approach to writing the *Cyropaedia* by Machiavelli in *The Prince* is reflected in the dual purpose of each work. Both of them act as a treatise and tract for the times. As a treatise each work sets forth timeless teachings on the qualities necessary for strong government and the need for self-control and constant striving for excellence in the man who would aspire to leadership. As a tract for the times, both reveal what ought to be done at a particular time by leaders: in Xenophon's case the men who controlled the Greek poleis of fourth century B.C., in Machiavelli's the leaders of the Italian city states of the sixteenth century. Martin Fleisher, a modern scholar of political science, neatly sums up Machiavelli's political

Coronea. Once he was installed in his estate in Scillus, Diogenes notes that he was able to work on his histories without interruption (D. L. 2.52). The banishment was not lifted until c. 365 B.C. but there is no evidence to assume that Xenophon automatically returned to Athens.

²⁴ Delebecque 1957, 384 ff. assumes that the *Cyropaedia* was written primarily with the political problems of Athens of the 360s in mind; however, there is no evidence to substantiate this ingenious interpretation of the work.

²⁵ Higgins 1977, 2 ff. gives a detailed analysis of Xenophon's prose style pointing his ability to write simply, but effectively and with precise possibilities of words, "Lucid and graceful, Xenophon's style tries, as a rule, not to call attention to itself. It is quite often content with ordinary words and frequently enjoys the description of ordinary, even humdrum, things in a generally uncomplicated syntax".

philosophy in words which could also be applied to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, "they [17th century republican thinkers] prized him ... for his idea, that is, that a people who have not been corrupted beyond the point of no return can revitalize their political existence and regain control of their fate through acts of political intelligence and energy inspired by bold leadership".²⁶ Xenophon's Cyrus epitomises this idea of inspirational and bold leadership; indeed, in the final chapter of the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon portrays for his Greek audience the moral and physical decline of the fourth century Persians as a negative example of what happens to a people who have been corrupted beyond the point of no return.

The qualities Machiavelli considers to be necessary for a successful prince can be found in Xenophon's depiction of Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia*. Machiavelli's political conception of the soul, *animo*, is one of a restless and bold force which motivates man into performing acts of courage and makes him magnanimous and great,²⁷ accords with Xenophon's portrayal of the noble *physis* of Cyrus, which manifests itself in his displays of *philotimia* and *philanthrōpia*. Similarly, his depiction of the powerful and potentially dangerous nature of *ambizione* in individuals, classes and states is reminiscent of Xenophon's discussion of *pleonexia* in the *Cyropaedia*. The importance Machiavelli attaches to tempering the dynamic force of *ambizione*, with *virtù* and *prudenza* as a means of producing a great leader - the kind of man he believes will save Italy in chapter 26 of *The Prince* - also recalls Xenophon's depiction of Cyrus as a leader whose

²⁶ Fleisher 1973, 116.

²⁷ This discussion of Machiavelli's terminology relies on Fleisher's definition of these terms in "A Passion for Politics" (Fleisher 1973, 118 ff.). Cf. Act 2 Scene 6 of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great* in which Tamburlaine speaks of his restless nature that makes him ambitious,

Nature that fram'd vs of foure Elements,
Warring within our breasts for regiment,
Doth teach vs all to haue aspyring minds:
Our soules, whose faculties can comprehend
The wondrous Architecture of the world:
And measure euery wandring plannets course,
Still climbing after knowledge infinite,
And alwaies moouing as the restles Spheares,
Wils vs to weare our selues and neuer rest. 869-877

ambitions are rendered acceptable because of his *aretē* and *sōphrosynē*.

In chapter 6 of *The Prince* Cyrus is worthy of being listed with other ancient leaders who have acquired or founded kingdoms - men such as Moses, Romulus and Theseus - and are deemed to be worthy of emulation. These mythical and historical leaders are united by the fact that their achievements were due to their own skill, their *epistēmē* of ruling, not chance, and their ability to seize the opportunity to become great princes. In Cyrus' case Machiavelli repeats what is implicit in the *Cyropaedia* and explicit in Herodotus' account of Cyrus' life. He claims that Cyrus' opportunity arose through the Persians' dislike of their subservience to the Medes, who had become soft and effeminate after a lengthy period of peace. The Medes' lack of involvement in warfare contributed to their downfall, a fact which ties in with Machiavelli's belief that good laws and good armies should be the two principal foundations of all states. Good laws cannot exist without good armies, and where there are good armies there must be good laws (c. 12). Cyrus' empire in the *Cyropaedia* is created on this principle: once Babylon is conquered he urges his officers not to relax from their military tasks and training (7.5.72 ff.), and he applies some ideas from his military training to the organisation of his empire (8.1.14 ff.). Machiavelli's prince must devote himself to war, to its institutions and to its discipline, particularly in peacetime when he is liable to be distracted by the pursuit of pleasure (c. 14). He equates the art of ruling with the art of generalship, a theme which dominates Cyrus' conversation with his father in chapter 6 of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia*. The Machiavellian prince must thus undergo an education which in some respects resembles the *paideia* of Cyrus,

E quanto alle opere, oltre al tenere bene ordinati ed esercitati li suoi, debbe stare sempre in sulle cacce, e mediante quelle assuefare el corpo a' disagi. *The Prince* c. 14

And as far as actions are concerned, besides keeping his soldiers well disciplined and trained, he must always be out hunting, and must accustom his body to hardships in this manner.

The prince is also advised to study the deeds of great men in histories, at which point Machiavelli mentions Xenophon's life of Cyrus (see above) as if to signal the influence of the *Cyropaedia* on the subsequent chapters of the treatise. Chapter 16 stresses the importance of the prince displaying generosity, *liberalità*, to his subjects in

order to keep them content, which resembles Cyrus' policy of *philanthrōpia* throughout the *Cyropaedia* and in particular in Book 8 (8.2.2 ff.).²⁸ In chapter 17 Machiavelli describes how a prince must make himself feared by his subjects without being hated; Xenophon describes Cyrus' rule over his vast empire in those terms at the beginning of the *Cyropaedia* (1.1.5). Chapter 18 deals with the kind of *pleonexia* discussed by Cyrus in chapters 3 and 6 of Book 1 of the *Cyropaedia*. Machiavelli advocates the use of deceit on certain occasions against one's enemies and one's subjects, and goes as far as to say that the prince must on occasion be a hypocrite and a liar, "essere gran simulatore e dissimulatore".²⁹ His use of analogies from the natural world and his reference to Achilles learning the nature of beasts from his tutor Cheiron the centaur recalls Cyrus and Cambyses' discussion of learning *pleonexia* in warfare by applying the skills gained during hunting expeditions on one's enemies.³⁰

Machiavelli recognises that the *Cyropaedia* was not faithful to historical truth but was composed in accordance with the truth behind the machinations of government and warfare. He sought to reproduce this kind of 'truth', as he makes perfectly clear in

²⁸ See Synopsis to chapter 4 in the Commentary for a discussion of Cyrus' *philanthrōpia*.

²⁹ In the *Discorsi* Machiavelli observes that Xenophon in the *Cyropaedia* calls attention to the need for a prince to practise deceit, through his depiction of how Cyrus gains his kingdom by deceit rather than in force in his treatment of his uncle Cyaxares (*Discorsi* 2.13.1 ff.).

³⁰ See Synopsis and Commentary on chapter 6 for analysis of Cyrus and Cambyses' discussion of trickery in warfare. Neal Wood, in an introduction to a translation of Machiavelli's *The Art of War*, draws parallels between Machiavelli and Xenophon in their equation of generalship and statecraft (Wood 1965, lvii ff.). However, he believes that Xenophon's political philosophy differs from Machiavelli in one crucial respect, "he [Xenophon] thinks always of the general's relation to his own army as one to a community of friends. Xenophon never recognizes that fellow-citizens or fellow-soldiers can be treated legitimately as foes" (*ibid.*, lviii). Such an opinion does not take into account Xenophon's presentation of Cyrus' leadership in Books 7 & 8 of the *Cyropaedia*. Cyrus deliberately removes himself from the society of his friends (7.5.37 ff.) and surrounds himself with a bodyguard (7.5.58 ff.), and he ensures that his noblemen do not unite amongst themselves, in order to secure his own position (8.1.45 ff.).

a well-known passage in chapter 15 of *The Prince*. He speaks of his intention to write something useful for anyone who understood it and to search for the effectual truth of the matter rather than its imagined one,

Ma sendo l'intento mio scrivere cosa utile a chi la intende, mi è parso più conveniente andare drieto alla verità effettuale della cosa che alla imaginazione di essa. *The Prince* c.15

But since my intention is to write something useful for anyone who understands it, it seemed more suitable to me to search after the effectual truth of the matter than the imagined one.

He subsequently criticises those authors who have written about imaginary rulers and governments, complaining that their creation of ideal rulers and governments bears no relation to reality. Machiavelli's criticism of such authors could be directed at the sixteenth century English scholars, Sir Thomas Elyot and Sir Philip Sidney, who mention the *Cyropaedia* and have a conception of Cyrus as an ideal, virtuous ruler that is closer to the portrayal of Cyrus in *The Wars of Cyrus* than Machiavelli's realistic view of him.³¹

Machiavelli's demonstration of his intuitive understanding of Xenophon's portrayal of Cyrus in *The Prince* may provide a clue to the prospective audience Xenophon himself was aiming at in the *Cyropaedia*, as well as explaining the success of the work in Hellenistic and Roman times. He writes in his preface to *The Prince* that one must be in the position of a prince in order to understand fully the nature of the people, just as a landscape painter would stand on top of a mountain to study the plains, and that in order to know the nature of princes one must be of the people, just as a painter would stand in a low position to consider the nature of mountains. Works of

³¹ Both Elyot and Sidney adopt the idealised view of Cyrus expressed by Cicero (see note 6). E.g. chapter 11 of Elyot's *The Governour*, which was first published in 1531 - one year before *The Prince*,

Xenophon, beyng both a philosopher and an excellent capitayne, so invented and ordred his warke named *Paedia Cyri*, which may be interpreted as the Childehode or the discipline of Cyrus, that he leaveth to readers therof an incomparable swetenes and example of lyvyng, specially for the conductynge and well ording of hostes or armyes.

and Sir Philip Sidney's *Defense of Poesy*,

For Xenophon, who did imitate so excellently as to give us an *effigiem iusti imperii*, the portraiture of a just empire, under the name of Cyrus (as Cicero saith of him) made therein an absolute heroical poem. (l. 274-276)

advice for those who are in a position of power, such as *The Prince*, have a double function. They are just as important for those who work with the rulers, for those who must understand their motivation and advise them, as for the rulers themselves. It was Machiavelli's business to know the nature of princes. In his role as diplomat he had to work with them and cope with the sudden shifts of power that characterised fifteenth and sixteenth century Italy. Xenophon, as someone who had experience of serving under different rulers and who had documented the shifts of power in fourth century Greece in the *Hellenica*, may also have had such a double function in mind when writing the *Cyropaedia*. The *Cyropaedia* is a study of a prince who knew very well the nature of people and accordingly reached the lofty heights of power, but it is also aimed at those people who would know the other side of the equation, the nature of princes, or in fourth century Greek terms, those who ruled their respective *poleis*.

It is, perhaps, more than coincidental that in the *Cyropaedia* and *The Prince* both authors avoid giving advice on one crucial concern of the ruler, that of securing the succession to his throne (see Appendix C on the question of the succession of Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia*). They, as omniscient narrators, who have dealt with kings and generals, occupy a privileged viewpoint in the middle ground between ruler and ruled, between mountain and plain, just as Otanes, the advocate of democratic rule in Herodotus' constitution debate, waives his right to the Persian throne in favour of a privileged freedom, preferring the safety of the position of neither ruling or being ruled (Hdt. 3.83). Xenophon and Machiavelli were both wise enough to realise that in view of the impermanence of political power, it was wiser to be prepared to protect one's own position at all times and to be able to serve more than one leader.

Bibliography

(Abbreviations conform to those adopted by *L'Année Philologique*)

Editions and Commentaries

Bizos, M., *Xénophon. Cyropédie I & II: Livres I-V*, Paris 1971-1973.

Dakyns, H.G., (translator) *The Education of Cyrus* (Introduction and notes by R. Stoneman), London 1992.

Delebecque, E., *Xénophon. Cyropédie III: Livres VI-VIII*, Paris 1978.

Gemoll, W., *Xenophontis Institutio Cyri* (editio W. Gemoll: editionem correctiorem curavit J. Peters), Leipzig 1968.

Gorham, G.M., *The Cyropaedia of Xenophon: from the text of L. Dindorf: with English Notes*, London 1883.

Holden, H.A., *The Cyropaedia of Xenophon Books I and II* (Part II Notes, Critical Appendix, and Indices), Cambridge 1887.

Marchant, E.C., *Institutio Cyri, Xenophontis opera omnia IV*, Oxford 1910.

Miller, W., (translator) *Xenophon. Cyropaedia* (vols I-II), Cambridge, Mass. & London 1914.

Works Consulted

Anderson, J.K., *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon*, Berkeley 1970.

----, *Xenophon*, London 1974.

----, *Hunting in the Ancient World*, Berkeley 1985.

Avery, H.C., "Herodotus' Picture of Cyrus", *AJP* 93 (1972), 529-546.

Barker, E., *Greek Political Theory*, London 1925.

Barns, J., "A New Gnomologium: with some Remarks on Gnomie Anthologies" (pt 1), *CQ* 44 (1950), 126-137 & (pt 2), *CQ* n.s. 1 (1951), 1-19.

Beck, F.A.G., *Greek Education 450-350 BC*, London 1964.

Bivar, A.D.M., See **Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H.**

Bondanella, P. (ed. & co-translator) *Niccolò Machiavelli The Prince*, Oxford 1987.

Bowman, A.K., & Woolf, G., (eds.) *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, Cambridge 1994.

Browner, J.P., "The Wars of Cyrus: An Early Classical Narrative Drama of the Child Actors", *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 28 (1942), 1-163.

Breebart, A.B., "From Victory to Peace: some Aspects of Cyrus' State in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*", *Mnemosyne* 36 (1983), 117-134.

Breitenbach, H.R., "Xenophon von Athen", *RE* IXA/2 (1966), 1569-2051.

Burn, A.R., *Persia and the Greeks*, London 1962.

Bury, R.G., "Plato and History" *CQ* n.s. 1 (1951), 86-93.

---, (translator) *Plato: with an English Translation VII (Timaeus, Critias, Cleitophon, Menexenus, Epistles)*, Cambridge, Mass. & London 1961.

Campbell, D.A., (translator) *Greek Lyric III: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides and Others*, Cambridge, Ma. & London 1991.

Carlier, P., "L' Idée de Monarchie Impériale dans la *Cyropédie* de Xénophon", *Ktéma* 3 (1978), 133-163.

Cartledge, P., "Hoplites and Heroes. Sparta's Contribution to the Technique of Ancient Warfare" *JHS* 97 (1977), 11-27.

---, "Literacy and the Spartan élite" *JHS* 98 (1978), 25-37.

---, "The Politics of Spartan Pederasty" *PCPhS* 27 (1981), 17-36.

---, *Agesilaos: and the Crisis of Sparta*, London 1987.

Cobet, J., *Herodots Exkurse und die Frage der Einheit seines Werkes (Hermes Einzelschr. 17)*, Wiesbaden 1971.

Cook, J.M., *The Persian Empire*, London 1983.

Craig, M.G., *Politics or Philosophy: An Interpretation and Analysis of Xenophon's 'Agesilaos'*, Diss. Claremont Graduate School, USA 1986.

- Davies, M.**, (ed.) *Poetarum Melicorum Graecum Volumen I*, Oxford 1991.
- Delebecque, E.**, *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon*, Paris 1957.
- , See also Editions and Commentaries.
- De Romilly, J.**, *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism*, Oxford 1963.
- , *The Rise and Fall of Greek States According to Greek Authors*, Ann Arbor 1977.
- Dihle, A.**, *A History of Greek Literature from Homer to the Hellenistic Period* (translated by Clare Krojzl), London & New York 1994.
- Dillery, J.**, *Xenophon and the History of His Times*, London & New York 1995.
- Donaldson, P.S.**, *Machiavelli and the Mystery of State*, Cambridge 1988.
- Donlan, W.**, "The Origin of Καλὸς καὶγαθός", *AJP* 94 (1973), 365-374.
- Dover, K.J.**, *Greek Popular Morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford 1974.
- , *Greek Homosexuality*, Oxford 1978.
- Drews, R.**, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*, Cambridge, Mass. 1973.
- , "Sargon, Cyrus and Mesopotamian Folk History", *JNES* 33 (1974), 387-393.
- Due, B.**, *The Cyropaedia: Xenophon's Aims and Methods*, Aarhus 1989.
- Farber, J.J.**, *Xenophon's Theory of Kingship* Diss. Yale 1959.
- , "The Cyropaedia and Hellenistic Kingship" *AJP* 100 (1979), 497-514.
- Fehling, D.**, *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (revised English ed. translated by J.G. Howie), Leeds 1989.
- Ferguson, J.**, *Moral Values in the Ancient World*, London 1958.
- , *Utopias of the Classical World*, London 1975.
- Fernández-Galiano, M.**, See Russo, J.
- Fleisher, M.**, "A Passion for Politics: The Vital Core of the World of Machiavelli", in:
- Fleisher, M.**, (ed.) *Machiavelli and the Nature of Political Thought*, London 1973, 114-147.
- Frye, R.N.**, "The Institutions", in: **Walser, G.**, (ed.) *Beiträge zur Achämenidengeschichte (Historia Einzelschriften: Heft 18)*, Wiesbaden 1972, 83-93.
- , *Heritage of Persia* 2nd ed., London 1976.

- Georges, P.**, *Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience*, Baltimore & London 1994.
- Gera, D.L.**, *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique*, Oxford 1993.
- Gershevitch, I.**, See **Mallowan, M.**
- Gomme, A.W.**, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Volume I*, Oxford 1945.
- Gosling, J., & Taylor, C.**, *The Greeks on Pleasure*, Oxford 1982.
- Gray, V.J.**, "Xenophon's Cynegeticus" *Hermes* 113 (1985), 156-172.
- , *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*, London 1989.
- Grottanelli, C.**, "La distribution de la viande dans la Cyropédie", *Metis* 4 (1989), 185-209.
- Hackett, J.**, See **Sekunda, N.**
- Hägg, T.**, *The Novel in Antiquity*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1983.
- Hall, E.**, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-definition through Tragedy*, Oxford 1989.
- Hawtrey, R.S.W.**, *Commentary on Plato's Euthydemus*, Philadelphia 1981.
- Henry, R.**, *Ctésias: La Perse, L'Inde et Les Sommaires de Photius*, Brussels 1947.
- Henry, W.P.**, *Greek Historical Writing. A Historiographical Essay Based on Xenophon's Hellenica*, Chicago 1967.
- Heubeck, A.**, See **Russo, J.**
- Higgins, W.E.**, *Xenophon the Athenian. The Problem of the Individual and Society of the Polis*, Albany, N.Y. 1977.
- Hindley, C.**, "Eros and Military Command in Xenophon", *CQ* n.s. 44 (1994), 347-366.
- Hirsch, S.W.**, *The Friendship of Barbarians. Xenophon and the Persian Empire*, Hanover, N.H., & London 1985.
- Höistad, R.**, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*, Uppsala 1948.
- Hornblower, S.**, *The Greek World 479-323 BC*, London 1983.
- How, W.W., & Wells, J.**, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (vols I-II), Oxford 1912.
- Howie, J.G.**, "Thukydides' Einstellung zur Vergangenheit: Zuhörerschaft und Wissenschaft in der Archäologie", *Klio* 66 (1984), 502-532.
- , "The Phaeacians in the Odyssey: Fable and Territorial Claim" *Shadow* 6 (1989),

---, "The Major Aristeia in Homer and Xenophon" in: *ARCA 34 Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 9, Leeds 1996, 197-217.

Jaeger, W., *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture* (Translated from the 2nd German ed. by Gilbert Highet, vols I-III), Oxford 1939-1945.

Keitel, E., "Homeric Antecedents to the *Cohortatio* in the Ancient Historians", *CW* 80 (1987), 153-172.

Kennedy, G., *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, Princeton, N.J. 1963.

Kenyon, F.G., *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* 2nd ed., Oxford 1951.

Krischer, T., "Die Stellung der Biographie in der griechischen Literatur", *Hermes* 110 (1982), 51-64.

Lattimore, R., "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus", *CPh* 34 (1939), 24-35.

Lawrence, T.E., *Seven Pillars of Wisdom: a Triumph*, London 1935.

Lazenby, J.F., *The Spartan Army*, Warminster 1985.

Lefèvre, E., "Die Frage nach dem Βίος εὐδαίμων: Die Begegnung zwischen Kyros und Kroisos bei Xenophon", *Hermes* 99 (1971), 283-296.

Lehmann-Haupt, C.F., "Der Sturz des Kroisos und das historische Element in Xenophons *Kyropaedie*", *WS* 47 (1929), 123-127 & 50 (1932), 152-159.

Levy, R., (translator) *A Mirror for Princes: The Qābūs Nāma by Kai Kā'ūs Ibn Iskandar Prince of Gurgān*, New York 1951.

Lewis, D.M., *Sparta and Persia*, Leiden 1977.

MacDowell, D.M., *Spartan Law (Scottish Classical Studies One)*, Edinburgh 1986.

Mallowan, M., "Cyrus the Great", in: **Gershevitch, I.**, (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Iran* (vol II), Cambridge 1985, 392-419.

Marrou, H.I., *A History of Education in Antiquity* (translated by G. Lamb), New York 1956.

Marschall, T., *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons*, Munich 1928.

Miller, W., See Editions and Commentaries.

Momigliano, A., *The Development of Greek Biography*, Cambridge, Mass. 1971.

----, *Alien Wisdom: the Limits of Hellenization*, Cambridge 1975.

Moore, J.M., *Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy*, London 1975.

Morgan, J.R., See **Tatum, J.**

Münscher, K., *Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Literatur* (*Philologus* Suppl. 13 Heft 2), Leipzig 1920.

Musa, M., (co-translator) See **Bondanella, P.**

Nickel, R., *Xenophon*, Darmstadt 1979.

Olmstead, A.T., *History of the Persian Empire*, Chicago 1948.

Page, D.L., (ed.) *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962.

Pearson, L., *Popular Ethics in Ancient Greece*, Stanford 1962.

Pomeroy, S.B., *Xenophon Oeconomicus: A Social and Historical Commentary*, Oxford 1994.

Praz, M., *Machiavelli and the Elizabethans* (offprint from the *Proceedings of the British Academy* 13), London 1928.

Pritchett, W.K., *The Greek State at War, I*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1971.

----, *The Greek State At War, II*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1974.

----, *The Greek State At War, III: Religion*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1979.

----, *The Greek State at War, IV*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1985.

----, *The Greek State at War, V*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1991.

Proietti, G., *Xenophon's Sparta*, Leiden 1987.

Rapp, H., "The Notion of Justice in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*", in: **Panou, S.**, (ed.) *Philosophy of Law in the History of Human Thought (12th World Congress)*, Stuttgart 1988, 37-47.

- Rawson, E.**, *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought*, Oxford 1969.
- Reardon, B.P.**, *The Form of Greek Romance*, Princeton 1991.
- Robb, K.**, *Literacy and Paideia*, New York & Oxford 1994.
- Roux, G.**, *Ancient Iraq* (3rd ed.), London 1992.
- Roux, J.**, *Euripide Les Bacchantes*, (vols I-II), Paris 1970.
- Russell, D.A.**, *Plutarch*, London 1973.
- Russo, J.** "Books XVII-XX", in: **Russo, J., Fernández-Galiano, M., & Heubeck, A.**, *Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume III, Books XVII-XXIV*, Oxford 1992, 3-127.
- Sage, P.W.**, "Tradition, Genre, and Character Portrayal: *Cyropaedia* 8.7 and *Anabasis* 1.9", *GRBS* 32 (1991), 61-79.
- Salmon, J.**, "Political Hoplitēs" *JHS* 97 (1977), 84-101.
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H.**, "The Death of Cyrus: Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* as a Source for Iranian History", in: **Bivar, A.D.M.**, (ed.) *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce (Acta Iranica 25)*, Leiden 1985, 459-471.
- Sekunda, N.**, "The Persians" in: **Hackett, J.**, (ed.) *Warfare in the Ancient World*, London 1989, 82-103.
- Sergeant, B.**, *Homosexuality in Greek Myth* (translated by A. Goldhammer), London 1987.
- Skemp, J.B.**, *Plato's Statesman: a Translation of the Politicus of Plato*, London 1961.
- Stadter, P.A.**, "Fictional Narrative in the *Cyropaedia*" *AJP* 112 (1991), 461-491.
- Stoneman, R.**, See **Dakyns, H.G.** (Editions and Commentaries) & see **Tatum, J.**
- Strauss, L.**, *On Tyranny. An Interpretation of Xenophon's Hiero*, New York 1948.
- Tatum, J.**, (ed.) *The School of Cyrus: William Barker's 1567 Translation of Xenophon's CYROPAEDIA*, New York 1987.
- , *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On The Education of Cyrus*, Princeton 1989.
- , "The Education of Cyrus", in: **Morgan, J.R., & Stoneman, R.**, (eds.) *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, London 1994, 15-28.
- Taylor, C.**, See **Gosling, J.**

Todd, J., *Persian Paideia and Greek Historia: An Interpretation of the Cyropaedia of Xenophon Book One*, Diss. Pittsburg 1968.

Trenkner, S., *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*, Cambridge 1958.

Tuplin, C., "Persian Decor in the Cyropaedia: Some Observations" *Achaemenid History, V. The Roots of the European Tradition*, (1990), 17-29.

Walser, G., See **Frye, R.N.**

Weissbach, F.H., "Kyros", *RE Suppl.* IV (1924), 1128-1177.

Wells, J., See **How, W.W.**

West, M.L., *Hesiod: Works and Days*, Oxford 1978.

Westlake, H.D., *Greek Historians and Greek History*, Manchester 1969.

Wheeler, F.M., *An Analysis of Method and Purpose in the Cyropaedia of Xenophon* Diss. Chicago 1962.

Wood, N., "Xenophon's Theory of Leadership", *C&M* 25 (1964), 33-66.

----, *The Art of War*, Indianapolis 1965.

Woolf, G., See **Bowman, A.K.**

Zimmerman, B., "Roman und Enkomion - Xenophons 'Erziehung des Kyros'", *WJA* 15 (1989), 97-105.

----, "Macht und Charakter: Theorie und Praxis von Herrschaft bei Xenophon", *Prometheus* 18 (1992), 231-244.